

6019. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of the executive board of the Boston League of Women Voters, disapproving of any increased appropriation for armament; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6020. By Mr. VARE: Petition of the G. R. C. State League of Pennsylvania, relative to social reform and labor questions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6021. Also, petition of the advisory board of the Philadelphia and Camden Federations, Pennsylvania system lines, asking an investigation of the Pennsylvania system conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6022. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the Grand Forks Council, No. 1260, Knights of Columbus, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

6023. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Osnabrock, N. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 23, 1921.

(Legislative day of Monday, February 14, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gay	Lenroot	Simmons
Brandeggee	Gerry	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Gooding	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Gronna	McKellar	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Harris	McLean	Smoot
Culberson	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Cummins	Heflin	Myers	Sterling
Curtis	Henderson	Nelson	Sutherland
Dial	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Trammell
Edge	Kellogg	Phipps	Underwood
Elkins	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	Kirby	Robinson	Williams
France	Knox	Sheppard	Willis
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Shields	Wolcott

Mr. BALL. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] are in attendance upon a hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] on official business.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] at a conference on the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by W. H. Overhue, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15682) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922; that the House had receded from its disagreement to sundry amendments of the Senate to the bill and agreed to the same; that the House receded from its disagreement to certain sundry amendments of the Senate and agrees to the same with amendments; and that the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 53, 65, 83, 104, and 106, and requests a further conference with the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to, cold-storage foods, to regulate shipments of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill, and requested a further

conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. YOUNG of Texas were appointed managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McNARY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House joint memorial No. 11 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 11, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 11th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZIER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 11.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate concurring, respectfully represent this:

Whereas there is a long strip of country along the southwestern coast of Oregon that has no adequate shipping facilities and the country is greatly retarded by lack thereof; and

Whereas the people of Port Orford, Curry County, Oreg., have organized a port district and have built a wharf at Port Orford at a cost of \$40,000; and

Whereas by a small expenditure of money a breakwater of approximately 500 feet in length could be built from a point near the present wharf to a point of rock in the ocean that would allow the largest vessels afloat to land at the wharf at all seasons of the year; and

Whereas there is a great demand for Port Orford cedar, and southwestern Oregon is the only part of the world where said cedar grows, and there is at present no proper shipping facilities for this and other products in said vicinity: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate concurring). That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, memorialized to take the necessary steps to have a survey made of the port of Port Orford with the view of making said breakwater or jetty.

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Oregon be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon in Congress.

Adopted by the senate February 10, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 2, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 11. Introduced by Mr. Peirce. W. F. DRAGER, Chief Clerk.

Filed February 11, 1921.

SAM A. KOZIER, Secretary of State.

Mr. McNARY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Sam A. Kozier, secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint memorial No. 8 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state February 11, 1921, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 11th day of February, A. D. 1921.

[SEAL.]

SAM A. KOZIER,
Secretary of State.

House joint memorial 8.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent that:

Whereas your honorable body has under consideration a bill compelling every manufacturer, or handler, or seller of woolen fabrics and woolen garments, to place thereon a tag plainly stating the exact percentage of virgin wool and also how much and what other materials enter into such cloth; and

Whereas such a law will be of inestimable value to both those who wear clothing and also to producers of wool and mohair; and

Whereas Oregon is interested, both as a producer and as a user of woolen goods: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring). That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact such legislation; and be it

Further resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit by mail a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the senate February 10, 1921.

ROY W. RITNER,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house February 2, 1921.

LOUIS E. BEAN,
Speaker of the House.

Indorsed: House joint memorial No. 8. Introduced by Messrs. Egbert and Riberts.
Filed February 11, 1921.

W. F. DRAGER,
Chief Clerk.
SAM A. KOZER,
Secretary of State.

Mr. McNARY. I present a resolution of the Lincoln Club of Jackson County, of Medford, Oreg., in relation to compensation of ex-service men of the World War, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LINCOLN CLUB OF JACKSON COUNTY,
Medford, Oreg.

Whereas the World War, like the great Civil War, was one fought to determine whether nations conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created free and equal can longer endure; and

Whereas the millions of splendid young Americans who made it possible for the allied nations to be successful willingly offered their lives, if need be, and sacrificed business careers and chances for advancement in their chosen work; and

Whereas the difficulties of readjustment are causing in many instances suffering and privations to those patriotic young citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Lincoln Club of Jackson County, the representative Republican organization of southern Oregon, place ourselves on record as being heartily in favor of any feasible plan to recompense, as much as we possibly can, the ex-service men of the last war; that we appreciate what they have meant to America and to the world; and that we feel that all of them should have the care and protection which this great Nation can afford; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor the fourfold plan of adjusted compensation, the one most likely to furnish these men quickest and most comprehensive relief.

THE LINCOLN CLUB OF JACKSON COUNTY,
By J. E. VINING, *President.*

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Decatur and Sheridan Counties, in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of the National Association of Dyers and Cleaners, of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the Council of Clubs of Kansas City, Kans., protesting against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of Toddsville Local, No. 3560, Farmers' Union, of Marmaduke, Ark., favoring legislation to prevent gambling in grain products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIS presented a resolution of Local No. 5, Licensed Tugmen's Protective Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring legislation placing a protective tariff on fish, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sulphur Springs, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation for the protection of maternity and infancy, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BALL presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Fourth Degree Assembly of Santa Maria Council, No. 195, Knights of Columbus, of Wilmington, Del., and a memorial of Anthony Giammatteo, of Wilmington, Del., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MYERS presented a resolution of Chief Ignace Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Kallispell, Mont., protesting against commercializing the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a resolution of the Constantine Grange, No. 236, of Constantine, Mich., protesting against the Nolan land bill taxing all farm property over \$10,000 1 per cent, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Detroit Butter and Egg Board, of Detroit, Mich., favoring the use of limewater for the

pasteurization of cream, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a resolution of the Lansing Trades and Labor Council, of Lansing, Mich., favoring the release of political prisoners now confined in Federal prisons, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions of the Baraga Council, No. 1585, Knights of Columbus, of Iron Mountain, and Owosso Council, No. 1139, Knights of Columbus, of Owosso, both in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented memorials of Owosso Council, No. 1139, Knights of Columbus, of Owosso, and Grayling Council, No. 1382, Knights of Columbus, of Grayling, both in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Lansing Trades and Labor Council, of Lansing, Mich., favoring the abandonment of further prosecution and imprisonment of violators of the espionage act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also (for Mr. NEWBERRY) presented a memorial of the Muskegon Coal Dealers' Association, of Muskegon, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Calder bill, to regulate the coal industry, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. FLETCHER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the enactment of House bill 13334, to prohibit, for the purpose of canning and export from Alaska, the fishing of salmon in the Yukon River, its tributaries and adjacent waters, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

He also presented a petition of Suwanee County Watermelon Growers' Association, of Live Oak, Fla., praying for readjustment of freight rates on shipments of watermelons from Florida to the northern and eastern markets, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition of Jackson County Farmers' Union, of Marianna, Fla., favoring the adoption of the emergency tariff bill in its present form, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution of the Rotary Club of Key West, Fla., favoring House bill 14899, making an appropriation of \$150,000 for the promotion of safety in the navigation of Key West waters, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

COLORADO RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask leave to present a report sent me by the State engineer of Nevada relative to a bill that was introduced by me and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, dealing with the utilization of the Colorado River. I ask to have it published in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. It is not very long. I merely wish to have it appear in the RECORD for the benefit of Senators who are interested in the matter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
Carson City, February 16, 1921.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,
Senior Senator from Nevada, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PITTMAN: Attached find certain data on the Colorado River situation which may be of interest to you. Please inform me as to your progress in interesting the Senators from the affected States in forwarding our proposed measure, copy of which is also inclosed.

Yours, truly,

J. G. SCRUGHAM,
State Engineer.

(Inclosures, 3.)

Memorandum relative to the distribution of costs and benefits resulting from the proposed construction of a large storage reservoir on the Colorado River.

NOVEMBER 17, 1920.

The Kinkaid Act, passed by Congress in May, 1920, entitled "An act to provide for an examination and report on the condition and possible irrigation development of the Imperial Valley in California," instructed the Secretary of the Interior to formulate a policy for this great enterprise, and particularly to make recommendations to Congress as to the extent to which in his opinion the United States should contribute to the cost of carrying out the plan; also the approximate proportion of the total cost which should be borne by the various irrigation districts or organizations now formed, or which may organize in the future and the manner in which their contribution should be made.

The Kinkaid Act carried an appropriation of \$20,000 for further investigations of Imperial Valley irrigation possibilities, conditioned on provision for at least one-half the cost of the investigations being provided for by associations and agencies interested in the lands of the Imperial Valley. The Imperial irrigation district has made a

contribution of \$40,000, and the board of public service of the city of Los Angeles has offered additional funds that may be necessary for the adequate completion of the study in time for report to Congress during the present winter.

Borings are being made for a dam site in what is known as Boulder Canyon, a narrow granite gorge through which the Colorado River passes situated near the extreme southern end of the State of Nevada. If the foundations prove satisfactory, it is proposed that a dam be constructed at this point for a possible maximum height of 600 feet, which would provide a storage capacity of approximately 25,000,000 acre-feet—sufficient to regulate the flood flow of the Colorado River above that point and provide a water supply sufficient to irrigate all lands reached by gravity below it, either in the United States or Mexico.

The importance of the problem can scarcely be overestimated. A conference was called to consider this subject in August, 1920, by Arthur P. Davis, Director of the United States Reclamation Service. About 100 delegates were present who were in favor of proceeding with the construction of the dam if it is found feasible to build it.

The writer has been requested to prepare this memorandum for the Colorado River committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce as to an equitable manner of distributing the costs and benefits that might result from this enterprise.

Fundamentally the main and controlling feature of this project should be considered as the irrigation of arid lands. The power that will be produced, which will be of great volume and value, should be generated in accordance with the irrigation demands. The various irrigation districts, mutual water companies, and corporate holdings of lands situated in California, Nevada, Arizona, and Mexico, should ultimately be the owners or holders of the title to the dam and reservoir, together with its accessories.

A study should be made of the necessities of each of these various units for additional water supplies based (a) upon the amounts which they respectively now have available from the natural flow of the river, and (b) the additional amount which they will require when each is fully developed. The relation of the additional irrigation water, if any, which each of these different units will require to the aggregate regulated water needed for the entire area, including all lands in Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, and Mexico, would represent the proportionate benefit which each unit would receive from the reservoir project and also their relative contribution or liability for the cost of the work. This association of units, which could be called a conservation district, either directly or through the agency of the United States Reclamation Service, would install and operate the power plant connected with the project, wholesaling in block the electric energy so developed, both to the units themselves as required, to distribution companies, transportation companies, and to municipalities. The revenues derived from this sale of power should be considered as a credit to the enterprise which would tend to substantially reduce the cost of the irrigation water supply to the conservation district.

If this great reservoir is constructed on the Colorado River, it will practically control the danger from flood damage for the irrigated areas between such reservoir and the mouth of the Gila River. The Gila, however, would not be controlled by this reservoir, and this stream is subject to extreme and violent floods almost equal in volume to the flood flows of the Colorado River itself above the Gila. The floods of the Gila do not synchronize, except upon rare occasions, with those of the Colorado. The high-water stages of the Colorado occur in May, June, and July, which, fortunately, is the period when irrigation water is most required, while those of the Gila are apt to occur in the early spring or later in the summer.

It is suggested that the flood-protection problem for each one of the units should be separately considered and an estimate made on the cost of completing the works under present existing conditions for their protection against flood damage. When the dam is built, or at the time of its completion, a separate estimate should be made for each unit of the cost of flood protection for it with the stream regulation that will follow the completion of the dam. In the units above the mouth of the Gila this saving will be shown to be substantial, but below the mouth of the Gila it will be relatively much less, because these lower areas still will have to be protected against the erratic and violent floods of the Gila. The saving in the cost of these flood-protection works that will result from the construction of the large reservoir should be assessed against the various units and credited to the cost of the project for the benefit of the conservation district.

The problem of the distribution of the irrigation water on the various units is local and one to be solved by each one of these communities separately and administered by them individually.

These various units should be so organized as to have the power of issuing bonds. They should be called upon to contribute to the conservation district bonds in an amount sufficient to cover their benefits as outlined above. The conservation district in turn should deposit these bonds together with any securities or assets that might be available in the form of power contracts with the proper officials of the United States Government as security for funds to be advanced by the Government for the construction of the works. The contribution of the Federal Government to the enterprise would thus consist in obtaining a low rate of interest, perhaps 5 per cent, on the money that is necessary for the installation of the works.

In addition the Federal Government will be interested in obtaining a water supply for many acres of arid public lands, especially around the perimeter of the Imperial Valley and in the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona. In this capacity it should contribute toward the enterprise on the ratio of the benefits received by such unit areas for a complete water supply therefor. Under the provisions of existing laws these public lands can be included in a State irrigation district, and can only be taken up from the United States subject to the bonded debt of the district in which they are situated. This offers the opportunity for the Government to obtain a refund for the moneys advanced for the irrigation and flood protection of these public lands.

According to this program the older districts on the river which at present have a fair water supply will only be assessed on the basis of such additional water as they may require for periods of the year when such supply is now insufficient, and districts that have completed their levee systems, so that they are satisfactory, as in the case of the Yuma project, will have little, if any, assessment against them for the construction of such flood-protection works.

In conclusion, the controlling feature of the enterprise should be considered as irrigation and the costs should be distributed according to benefits received.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT.

NEW YORK STATE BARGE CANAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of H. R. 10453, which were, on page 1, in lines 10 and 11, strike out "within said 30 days, or as soon thereafter" and insert "as soon"; on page 1, in line 11, after "as," where it occurs the second time, insert "is"; on page 1, in line 11, strike out "all"; on page 1, in line 13, after "canal," strike out all down to and including "buy," in line 15; and on page 2, in line 1, strike out all after "same" down to and including "final," in line 8, and insert:

Provided, That all the money obtained from the sale or lease of these boats, barges, and tugs shall be available until expended by the inland and coastwise waterways service of the War Department in the inauguration and development of other inland, canal, and coastwise waterways in accordance with the expressed desire of Congress in section 500 of the transportation act, 1920: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 25 per cent of the boats, barges, and tugs built or purchased for the United States, herein authorized to be sold, may be retained by the United States for the operation of other inland, canal, or coastwise routes of the United States, until such equipment can be replaced by other equipment to be purchased from funds received from the sale prescribed above.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to exempt the New York State Barge Canal from the provisions of section 201 of the transportation act, 1920, and for other purposes."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15943) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 809) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 663) fixing the term of service of Elijah C. Putnam during the Civil War, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 810) thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13944) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 811); and

A bill (H. R. 14063) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 812).

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

A bill (S. 5031) for the relief of the heirs of Robert E. L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LENROOT:

A bill (S. 5032) for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Shirland Avenue, in the city of Beloit, Wis.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PITTMAN:

A bill (S. 5033) for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; and

A bill (S. 5034) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey title to certain lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a conference report on the Indian appropriation bill. I do not wish to call up the report at this time, but merely submit the report in order that it may be printed in the Record.

CLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, on March 22 last Senate bill 4106, to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and the standardization of compensation therefor, and for other purposes, was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], of the Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries. The bill on being introduced, together with the report of the Reclassification Commission, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I was not present in the Chamber when the bill was

introduced and the report of the commission presented or I should have asked that the bill and report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, where they properly belong.

The bill provides for legislation in regard to the various branches of the civil service in the District of Columbia. I call attention to just two or three of the subjects covered in the bill. First, "allocation," providing that "the commission shall, as soon as practicable, designate the class within which the position of each employee should be placed in accordance with the duties of such position." Another subject is "amendments to classification." Another subject is "compensation." Other subjects are "efficiency ratings," "promotion appointments," "hours of service," "transfers," and other kindred subjects pertaining to the civil service.

I think it very obvious that the bill should go to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment. It was not properly referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the consideration of the bill and report and that they be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall object to that request.

Mr. STERLING. Then, Mr. President, I move—

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. STERLING. I move, then, that the bill and the report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. STERLING. I desire to say that at the earliest opportunity I shall renew my motion that the bill and report be referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15812) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 48, after line 16, to insert:

For the investigation and development of methods for the prevention of grain-dust, smut-dust, and other plant-dust explosions and resulting fires, including fires in cotton gins and cotton oil mills, \$25,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, my inquiry has really been answered by glancing at the Record, although I was of the impression that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] had asked that the first amendment on page 48 go over, with the understanding that it would be taken up this morning. May I ask if the Senator from Wisconsin would object to taking the amendment up now? It would be a very great accommodation to me, I will say to the Senator, as I have an important conference waiting for me, and I should be glad to have the item now disposed of. I ask unanimous consent, with the permission of the Senator from Wisconsin, that the first amendment on page 48 may be now considered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am willing that the item shall be disposed of this morning. I only expressed the wish that it go over until this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood from the discussion last night that the committee was willing that the amendment striking out the item should be disagreed to, and if the Senate thought proper, that the appropriation should be increased from \$23,500 to \$50,000. If there is no objection, the Chair will put the question on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment striking out "\$23,500" and inserting "\$50,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on striking out the House text as amended.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House text now stands in the bill, with \$50,000 appropriated.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 48, after line 20, to insert:

For the study of processes and methods of home tanning of lace and other leathers used on the farm, \$15,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from North Dakota as to the preceding amendment, the one which

was just agreed to, whether there was an estimate made for the item which reads:

For the investigation and development of methods for the prevention of grain-dust, smut-dust, and other plant-dust explosions and resulting fires, including fires in cotton gins and cotton oil mills, \$25,000.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator there is a larger estimate than the sum appropriated. I think the estimate was for \$100,000. I will look it up in just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire what lace leather is? I know there was a species of "home tanning" in vogue when I was a small boy, but that was some time ago. Since then home tanning of lace and other leathers seems to need recognition. What is the home tanning of lace leather? Who knows?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not artistic.

Mr. GRONNA. There was an estimate made for the item.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not the estimate about which I am inquiring. I want to know what lace leather is.

Mr. GRONNA. I was trying to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. SMOOT. I had asked the Senator from North Dakota if there had been an estimate for the item beginning in line 17, on page 48.

Mr. GRONNA. There was an estimate for \$100,000 for this purpose this year. Last year's bill carried \$23,500 and the House inserted a like provision in this bill for \$23,500.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not mean the item in regard to dehydrating materials. I referred to the item "for the investigation and development of methods for the prevention of grain-dust, smut-dust, and other plant-dust explosions."

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that there is an estimate for that purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to be a new item in the bill, and I was wondering whether we were going to enter upon that line of work.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a superfluous inquiry. We are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have, according to the impression of the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS. We have.

Mr. SMOOT. I was fearful of it.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will read from the letter of the department in regard to the item for the prevention of grain-dust explosions. This is a new item; it was recommended and estimated for, but was not included in the House bill. The department says:

Plant-dust explosions and fires have resulted in large losses of life and property. The educational work based on the department's researches, which has been carried on during the past three years in co-operation with the United States Grain Corporation, was terminated July 1, 1920. The results of the campaign were very gratifying, and during the three years that the Grain Corporation operated it suffered no extensive explosion or fire losses. The fact that at practically no time was the value of stocks in storage less than \$100,000,000, and that at certain times it reached approximately \$500,000,000, shows the importance of the saving thus effected, to say nothing of the safeguarding of human life.

I will say to the Senator that the estimate was for \$50,000.

Mr. SMOOT. There was, then, an estimate for it?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; the estimate was for \$50,000, as will be found in the Book of Estimates, on page 276. We cut that estimate in two, however, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] suggests.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the same question as to the amendment found on page 48, lines 21 and 22, reading as follows:

For the study of processes and methods of home tanning of lace and other leathers used on the farm, \$15,000.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator will find the estimate on page 276 of the Book of Estimates, as follows:

For investigating the utilization of agricultural raw materials in the production of leather, tanning, and leather-making materials, and for developing and demonstrating improved methods or processes for producing leather, \$15,000.

The committee changed the wording a little, but the item was estimated for.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] made an inquiry a moment ago as to what was meant by lace leather. It is leather derived from a peculiar form of tanning available for lacing belts, shoes, and so forth.

While I am on my feet I wish to call attention to the fact that I do not believe there is an item in this bill that is possibly fraught with more benefit to the country at large than the item which will enable the department to attempt to find some method by which people can relieve themselves of the intolerable burdens placed upon them in connection with the purchase of their leather and leather supplies, including shoes, and so forth. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who does not

recognize that of all the oppressive and iniquitous combinations in this country, the shoe and leather combine is perhaps the worst. I understand that there is being worked out a system of tanning by which local and small industries and possibly the home may be afforded some kind of relief from this intolerable burden.

We were told that we had an oversupply of hides, and so we took the duty off of hides; we took the duty off of leather and shoes, but the price went up, showing that there is no relief from this iron-bound combination.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator must be mistaken about that; he can not mean that following the removal of the duty the price of leather went up.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Surely.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a political impossibility.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It may be a political impossibility, but it is a commercial fact.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado directed to me an inquiry as to what lace leather is.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from South Carolina gave me the information, which is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator, if he will permit me, that this is an item in which the farmers generally are very much interested. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is very anxious to have this provision in the bill. Lace leather is used very largely in the sewing together of belts of all kinds, and is also used in mending and repairing harness. I farm on a somewhat large scale, and, of course, perhaps I use more of this leather than does the ordinary farmer; but I will say to the Senator from Colorado and to the other Senators that sometimes I use in connection with my farm work \$25 worth of lace leather in a single day.

The hides that the farmers produce are worth practically nothing to them. I received an invoice of hides shipped by a farmer in South Dakota a few days ago, which I put into the Record, and from which it appears that the hides netted the farmer less than 1 cent a pound. Lace leather costs the farmer from \$1.50 to \$3 a pound. If by the expenditure of \$15,000 we can teach the farmers how to tan the hides in a practical manner—and calfskins and light-weight hides are being used for lace leather—and to use them on the farm, there will be a saving of millions of dollars to the farmers throughout the country. It is a practical proposition, and I can not see why there should be any objection to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, my comment upon the item was not an objection, because I have long ago ceased to make objections to items in the Agricultural appropriation bill. I simply wanted some information with regard to the character of material which the Government is to study at a cost of \$15,000 a year to the taxpayers.

Long ago we reached the point where any activity upon a farm, no matter where it may occur or what the activity is, at once proceeds with lightning speed to the city of Washington for an appropriation and for paternal investigation by the Government at so much per year. In the good old days when farming was farming, when farmers were not farmed as they are nowadays, the methods of securing for themselves needed articles both of production and of manufacture proceeded quite as well as if not better than since it has become what might be called an appropriation industry.

If it be true that the placing of leather upon the free list has resulted in its increase of price, then it must follow that the chief benefit to be derived by legislation in that regard is to put a high duty upon it and bring down the price. If that result would follow I might be induced to vote for a very high rate of protection. It is, of course, very important, if possible, to develop methods for the prevention of grain-dust and other explosions and resulting fires; but the destruction of gins and other factories engaged in the treatment of cotton by the incendiary fires that have punctuated the Associated Press dispatches for some time, and which seem to be designed to compel a restriction in cotton production, might also become the subject of investigation by an appropriate amount to be devoted for that purpose by the Congress, and which, perhaps, might also produce some very startling if not beneficial results.

I was greatly struck yesterday by a new method of securing appropriations in this bill. That is to produce some samples of the particular subject that is sought to be sweetened by an appropriation and pass them around to Senators. We had some figs and some dates yesterday, which cost the people of the United States just \$10,000. Hereafter I have no doubt that when this bill is to be considered the Senate Chamber will be converted into a delicatessen store, and each Senator will have

behind him his wares, goods, and merchandise to be passed around and sampled by the lawmakers, whose votes will be influenced to some degree by the palatable nature of the commodity which is sought to be protected. I hope that will not be extended to the animal department of this bill. You know we now make large appropriations for the purpose of exterminating predatory animals. There is one predatory animal whose presence in the Chamber might change its atmosphere and result in a stampede instead of an appropriation, so I hope the line will be drawn by those who desire to secure appropriations hereafter by confining the exhibits entirely to vegetables and fruits.

These two appropriations, Mr. President, will become permanent from now on. We shall be investigating and developing methods for the prevention of grain-dust and other dust explosions and resulting fires in the good year of our Lord 2222, provided always the Treasury has anything to appropriate by that time; and from now on the Agricultural Department will make a perpetual study of the processes and methods of home tanning of lace and other leathers.

It is one of those perpetual-motion investigations which has one beginning, but no end; and 50 years from now the aggregate amount of the appropriations made for these purposes, which, of course, will increase in constant progression, will be sufficient at least to make us realize that something has been done by the Government in that direction.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from a man who professes to be a farmer, and I think he makes his profession good. He seems to take a different view of the status of the farmer and of his financial condition from that which prevails in this Chamber, and which is always dwelt upon with eloquent unction whenever an appropriation is desired to assist the agricultural industry. I ask leave, as part of my remarks, to introduce it in the Record, together with a communication of this gentleman to the Nebraska State Journal of December 16, 1920, entitled "Ill-advised legislation." It will be a sort of an oasis in this desert of widespread and constantly increasing items of appropriation for the farmer. While it will do no good, it will serve to relieve my mind just a little.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter and communication will be printed in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VILLAGE FARM,
Funk, Nebr., December 25, 1920.

Senator THOMAS.

DEAR SIR: I am inclosing a letter that was published in the Lincoln State Journal recently, inasmuch as so much is being said about the "distress of the farmer," which is purely buncombe. I believe you will be interested in the history contained in this letter. I want to say that if anyone will come here in this country that has been cursed in past years with almost repeated crop failures I will show him many men, renters in the past, who 10 years ago were worth practically nothing, who are comparatively rich now, and so with every farmer who made the most of his opportunities, like the laboring man, who by the big wages has gotten a taste of the better things of life and becomes discontented because he falls in the full fruition of his ambition. So the farmer, urged on by the professional agitator, is discontented because he is checked in his onward advance toward large wealth. I am a Republican, have entertained Senator Norris in my home, he and I once were very good friends, but I do not send this to him because he is the "farmers' friend," from a vote-getting standpoint, and facts and logic would have little weight with him. I send it to you because I have always admired your courage and fearlessness in standing against the fads and foolishness put up by the dreamers and theorists and would-be wreckers of this country. I am extremely sorry that you are not going back, as in times of stress and turmoil our country needs such men as you.

Yours, truly,

L. T. BROOKING.

P. S.—This section of country I speak of lies between Hastings and Oxford, and Funk is 200 miles west of Omaha.

THE PUBLIC MIND—ILL-ADVISED AGITATION.

FUNK, NEBR., December 14.

To the EDITOR OF THE STATE JOURNAL:

With the governors and senators in our West talking about conditions being "critical" and "tragical" for the farmers, and demanding that something must be done immediately for their relief, with some of the farmers talking the same way, we may begin to wonder to what condition of mind are we drifting. When men seem to have lost either their reason or their memories.

I built the first house in our little town 33 years ago, and being in the grain-elevator business for 18 years was in constant touch with the farmers, and in conditions surrounding them. I am now trying to make a living on 6 acres of land, and in a position to prosper or otherwise, the same as the farmers, by the rise and fall of prices. I have a good remembrance of past crops and prices, hence I believe I am fairly well qualified to take an impartial view of the present conditions. I can well remember the struggle for existence the farmers of this community had, and myself as well, through the period of 1894 and 1895, years of crop failures and low prices. I can well remember the bumper crop of corn, and the disastrous hailstorm that destroyed the small-grain crop of 1896; how I bought 140,000 bushels of corn at 9 cents per bushel of that crop—1897 and 1898 came with fairly good crops, but the price was still extremely low; 1899, 1900, and 1901 came with almost total failures, much corn had to be bought at advanced prices and the freight to pay. The big crop of 1902 came and the wheat was sold at an average price of around 50 cents per

bushel. The corn was frozen the 12th of September and little or none marketed; good crops followed until 1907, and from this period we had eight dry years with short crops and much corn shipped in.

This brings us up to the wet year of 1915. During all these years of short crops, with the exception of one year when wheat reached the dollar mark, price for wheat was considerably below \$1, and very little corn to sell, and some years it was shipped in. Just how our farmers managed to get through all these years of failure and low prices and at the same time reconstruct this country from a country of sod houses and sod outbuildings to a country of the finest farm properties the sun ever shone upon is a story well worth the efforts of some historian to tell, but not for me to undertake in this article; but they did it, and under the most adverse conditions.

The period from 1915 up to the present I need not dwell upon, it speaks of prices; prices that in the past periods were never dreamed of even by the wildest agitator, but when we consider the crops and prices of the years up to 1915 and all that was accomplished by the sturdy industry, the undying grit and tenacity of our pioneers, and consider the good crops and in a comparative sense the fabulous prices that all farm products have been bringing for the last five years, it is beyond my comprehension how any man can be so lost to the true condition as to use the terms "critical" and "tragic."

While our crops in this section of the State for the past five years could be called good, they have been better both east and west of us, and this section can well be taken as a criterion if any real distress was apparent. Outside of some who may have mismanaged and some who may have had a large share of ill luck, the situation is not "critical" or "tragic"; it is not even serious; a large majority of the farmers will not make the usual money this year and are doomed to disappointment, but all those who have not gotten deeply in debt by buying more land and who have conducted their business in a prudent way can pay every dollar they owe and have money left. During the war the Government officials spoke in terms of billions instead of millions, and so we have gotten the habit of speaking in terms of thousands where we formerly spoke of hundreds, and sums that formerly seemed large seem very small to us now, and added to this is the politician who wants to pose as the "farmers' friend" for the votes there is in it, and knows that the shortest route to this consummation is to be constantly taking the part of the dissatisfied farmers, whether there is any basis for the discontent or not. Then we have the promoter who adds to the farmers' discontent with the hope of getting \$18 for this, \$10 for that, and \$2.50 for the other. Surely the millennium is dawning for the farmer if he gets the one-hundredth part of what is promised him. A lot of these agitators—and some may be sincere, but, in my judgment, shortsightedly—seem to think that the only way the farmers can get justice is to organize a gigantic farmers' organization, with the express object of entirely controlling legislation. This is what the Federation of Labor has been striving for, and to which we have all so strenuously objected. If carried out according to promise, we have a government by class and not a government by all the people, and threaten the downfall of our Republic or a state of class and business demoralization. No class, whether labor, farmer, or business, can be trusted with power; it at once becomes autocratic; and even the class in power would not prosper as under our present government by all the people.

If the agitator would go to work and earn an honest living without trying to make it out of the people's discontent, this period of reconstruction would work out, as water finds its level; so would prices eventually. We know there is much injustice and inequality; too many making too much and too many making too little. Some have too much and some not enough. We know all these things, and if any remedy that is safe and sane and in justice to all classes can be applied we can all favor it, but let us look with suspicion upon all agitation that tends to upset the order of things and to bring about class power. The credulous man who is in poor health and has failed to get the expected relief from his old reliable family physician falls an easy victim to the traveling quack, who has a remedy for every ill and who promises relief at so much per bottle; and so the dissatisfied, credulous man is quick to patronize the political quack who has a remedy for every economic ill, and hence the stock in trade of these political charlatans is to create discontent by enlarging upon existing evils, and many that do not exist, and I believe if these agitators did not exist there would be but little discontent at the present time; that they are the chief cause, and not because any appreciable number of farmers are in distress. I am in daily touch with many farmers, retired and active, many of them are not discontented, but inclined to compare the present prosperous times with times past, that I have mentioned.

They take a philosophic view of conditions. They are proof against the traveling charlatan and take a hard-headed, sensible view of the situation. This agitation is not caused by the present depressed prices of farm products, but was started when wheat was \$2.30 and corn around a dollar. This is a very significant fact, and plainly shows the hand of the element I have mentioned. The best friend of the farmer is the man who is trying to get all classes to pull together in a united effort to keep this Nation of ours big in a big way. To keep business going, to keep labor employed, thus making a market for his products, to discourage all efforts to tear down and upset the order of things, for as all classes depend upon each other, so distress to either one reacts upon the other, who preaches contentment to him instead of inflaming his passions, who encourages him to have faith in himself and in our institutions, to have faith in the future of his business, to have faith in the men selected to handle the big affairs of the Nation, and not to put a blind faith in the ax-grinding politician and promoter who is after his earnings and who fattens upon his discontent. Let us all get rid of this "get-rich-quick" notion and settle down to business; let us try and reason out this problem in a spirit of unselfishness, as nearly all wars are the result of selfishness; so this organizing of class against class is based upon selfishness, and while many favor it who are in favor of exact justice, the level-headed man knows that class power will never stop at that and that class power means autocracy and nothing else in the practical application. I have never had any political aspirations and am not guided in my expressions by how many votes of any class that I may get, hence I am free to say what I believe to be true, and I believe that the men who are so freely expressing themselves about the distress of the farmers are not guided by the true facts, but are either political demagogues or have not gotten the real facts of the situation. I have observed that the farmers who are the loudest in expressing their discontent are the ones that have made the big money in the last five years. When this reconstruction period is over it will be found that a hundred business men will have gone bankrupt to every one farmer, we will all be thinking in terms of hundreds instead of thousands, will be burning a little less gas, will be satisfied with a little less profit, and the people of this part of the State, who changed this from a country of sod houses in a

period of adversity to a country of the finest farm homes in America, will not go bankrupt, will not suffer any distress as long as we have reasonable production and prices we can reasonably expect. Some may be induced to take the medicine mixers' medicine, but in the long run his industry, his tenacity to stick and farm, his desire to own good homes for himself and stock, his capacity for economizing when necessary, is going to take him through all emergencies, regardless of all the calamity howlers on earth. I have this faith in a big majority of the farmers, whose condition is not "critical" or "tragic."

Respectfully,

L. T. BROOKING.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I ask that the estimate of the department be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

LEATHER AND TANNING INVESTIGATIONS.

Page 46, between lines 22 and 23, insert:

"For investigating the utilization of agricultural raw materials in the production of leather and tanning and leather-making materials and for developing and demonstrating improved methods or processes for producing leather, \$15,000."

This is a new item. It was proposed in the estimates but not included in the bill reported from the House committee.

Work on leather and tanning materials has been carried on in a small way by the Bureau of Chemistry for many years, but the desirability of making special provision for an investigation of this type is particularly important in view of the scarcity of leather and leather-making materials at the present time. The long-used vegetable tanning materials, which are direct products of the forest and farm, are totally inadequate under present conditions to supply the country's needs and others should be sought and developed. No investigations of leather and leather-making materials can be properly organized and completed which do not consider the composition and effect of the various tanning materials on the wearing qualities of leather.

Large quantities of hides, skins, and tanning materials are imported annually, much of which would be unnecessary if all the leather made in this country were of better quality. About one-third of the hides and skins used in this country are now supplied by country butchers and farmers. Owing to carelessness and lack of knowledge in curing these hides and skins, it is estimated that the farmer and country butchers lose annually \$15,000,000, while the loss to the country in leather value is probably more than double that amount.

The work contemplated under this item has primarily an agricultural significance. The interests of agriculture in raw materials for leather making, in tanning, and in leather and leather substitutes are paramount, since the agricultural industry supplies nearly all the raw material and the farming population is the largest single class of consumers of the finished products. There are few industries more closely related to agriculture than that of tanning, and any research work in the field of tanning must be based primarily on agriculture. Owing to the discrepancy between the present low price of hides and the continued high price of leather, the department is now flooded with inquiries from farmers and others regarding the possibility of home tanning in a small way. The department desires, if this item is approved, to make some experiments along the line of developing processes for tanning on the farm. Whether or not such processes are practicable can not be determined without experimentation. If such a process can be worked out, it would result in a great saving to the farmers of the country, either by permitting them to do a great deal of their own tanning or by exerting its influence in maintaining a more equitable relation between value of raw material and of finished product.

Other countries have found it necessary to undertake investigations of the character proposed under this item.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word in support of this item. I was one of the Senators on the Agricultural Committee who were responsible for the insertion of the item.

I doubt if there is in the bill any small item like this \$15,000 which will do more practical good to the farmers than this one, and I speak as a farmer—not that I dig in the ground myself, but I have a plantation, and use a good deal of leather. On one of my recent statements of current expenses I noticed that hame strings were charged at 50 cents each—50 cents for a single hame string!—and there are a great many hame strings used on every farm every year. We use a great deal of farm machinery now, and in that machinery and connected with it are a number of belts. It is absolutely necessary to lace the leather belts with lace leather. The belts themselves are made of leather, and they are laced with lace leather. There is a very large quantity of leather used on every farm, and leather is one of the most expensive things that farmers have to buy.

There is hardly a farm that does not slaughter every year a few head of cattle for home consumption, and at the present time, when the farmers are unable to sell their hides, I see no reason why they should not tan or dress on the farm leather for home consumption. It would save them a very material sum every year. In the aggregate, on the millions of farms in this country, it is my candid belief that millions and millions of dollars would be saved if the farmers could be taught how to tan the leather at home, especially lace leather. I am certain, from my practical knowledge and experience on that subject, that it would be very beneficial; and I do not believe there is a single item in this bill that would be of more substantial, practical, everyday benefit to the farmers than this. I sincerely hope it will be kept in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any doubt but that the item will be kept in the bill. But I have not the same faith the Senator from

Louisiana has with reference to its great benefits. Of course, I know, Mr. President, that under it there will be some people employed to run around the country. But the idea of appropriating \$15,000 to find out some new process for tanning leather, when America is renowned the world over for the best processes of tanning leather. There is no secret about it. Everybody interested knows how it is accomplished.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. RANSDELL. I would appreciate very much if the Senator would give me his recipe for doing it. I have been trying to get one. I have a number of hides on my plantation which I could not sell for anything. I do not believe I could give them away. I believe they would be in the same class as the sheep sent from Montana the other day, which netted 32 cents a head in the Chicago market after paying all expenses. I believe I would have to give my hides away in just exactly that same manner. I have been trying to get a recipe for tanning so that I could send it down to my manager, and I finally got a long document from the Department of Agriculture, which is so difficult to understand and apply that I am not going to ask my plantation manager to try to understand it.

The Senator says everybody knows how to do it. I ask him right now to please send me his recipe, so that I can use it on my plantation.

Mr. SMOOT. Everybody does not know a process by which one hide can be successfully and profitably tanned, nor will anybody ever find such a process. Mr. President, this is going back to the ages when every housewife knit her husband's socks, and darned them with the wool taken from the sheep's back, when she washed it and carded it and spun it into yarn, and then wove it into cloth and then made the cloth into suits. Nobody could possibly take one hide and make leather out of it profitably to himself or to anyone else.

The Senator is speaking of the letter from the Agricultural Department, which nobody could understand, in answer to one sent by him, a letter which will not be clarified by the item under consideration. Continue this appropriation of \$15,000 for the next hundred years for the same purpose, and increase it each year if you will, and at the end of the hundred years there would be nobody in all the world who could understand it any better than the Senator does to-day. So, Mr. President, this is but the beginning of a new appropriation to employ certain people to run around the country to pay a visit to the farmer and talk as to how the weather is and how the children are—

Mr. THOMAS. Not the weather, but the leather.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the weather. Leather will be very, very far removed from the discussion that will take place. If there was any real chance of getting any benefit for the farmer or anyone else, I would not object to the appropriation. But the idea is absurd that a farmer will kill a calf and have it skinned and take that skin and try to tan it under any process that was ever known or ever will be known. Business is not carried on to-day on that scale. It would cost him more than its weight in silver dollars.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, for the information of my friend the Senator from Utah I want to inform him that there are quite a number of people in my State, and I expect a few in his State, who are doing that now. I refer to the American Indians. They know how to tan, and they are doing it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the American Indians take a buck's skin and tan it, and that is about the only thing they have ever tanned and they have given that work up lately.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the American Indian knows how to do this, should not this appropriation be made for him, and should we not set him to work on the plantations in Louisiana and in North Dakota?

Mr. RANSDELL. If the American Indian could be induced to give the recipe for tanning buckskin to the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture could issue a plain, simple bulletin, not to send men all around the country, as the Senator from Utah suggests, but just issue a plain, simple bulletin giving the home recipe of the American Indian, that would be fine, it seems to me. I know when I was a boy we used to kill a good many deer in my section, and we would get the nearest Indian to dress the deer skins for us. They were wonderfully useful. I have not seen a dressed deer skin for many years, but if I could get cow hides or calf hides dressed as well as those deer skins were dressed, it would answer my purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. No Indian ever tanned a cowhide or a calf hide. The only reason the Senator sent his deer skin to the

Indian was that it did not cost him anything for the Indian to treat it, for he simply made a frame and stretched the skin to the size of the frame and dried it out. Neither the Senator nor anyone else living in his State could afford to take the time to follow that slow process. The Indian did not make a cent a day out of it. All he got out of it was that at the end he sold it for 50 cents or a dollar, and the Indian considered himself that much ahead.

The American people are not going back to the Indian style of making buckskin. No Indian ever made any leather. I know, of course, the prices charged for lace leathers, which has been referred to by the Senator from North Dakota. Mr. President, I was superintendent of a woolen mill, which had all of the machinery necessary for an 8-set mill requiring 400 employees. Some of the belts required were over 24 inches wide and all of the machinery was driven from the main shaft by belts, and the lace leather never cost us \$75 for a whole year running 24 hours every day. I can not understand why the Senator was compelled to pay \$25 for lace leather for a few thrashing machines running a few weeks each year.

Of course, it is perfectly useless trying to get an appropriation cut out of the bill, but I did want to say that if the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] remains in the Senate for 30 years, at the end of 30 years he will find this item in the Agriculture appropriation bill, if it goes in now, except that it will be for an increased amount.

Mr. President, on page 48 of this very bill the first item we find is:

For investigating the grading, weighing, handling, transportation, and uses of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$10,000.

I remember when the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] stood upon the floor of the Senate and asked for that appropriation about six years ago. He said he thought the appropriation ought to be made, and it would not take more than \$10,000. As I remember, two years ago, when a similar appropriation was under discussion, he said, "Well, just let it go in once more." It went in once more. It is in again once more, and, Mr. President, as long as the Senate will vote for this appropriation it will remain in once more.

I do not know any reason why such an investigation of naval stores should be made now, nor why it should have been extended beyond the first appropriation. I can not see why we should throw \$10,000 away for that purpose. I only point to this item to show that whenever an appropriation gets in the bill it will remain in, no matter whether it is necessary or whether it is unnecessary.

I am not saying this particularly as affecting the pending bill. It is about the same in every appropriation bill. This is no different from the other appropriation bills in that respect. When once the items get into the bill, Mr. President, it is almost impossible to make a change. Of course, if the Senate wants to put this item in, well and good.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the adoption of this amendment, but I can not help feeling that there seems to be a disposition among some of the Senators here to attack every little item in this particular bill. I realize as much as anyone here does that we are perhaps trespassing upon the great industries of the country if we are to teach the farmers of the country how they will be able to manufacture some of the leather to be used on the farms.

I realize that if we do that we will take from the profits of tremendous concerns, and I am not trying to prevent these huge corporations from making profits. I am not trying to legislate so as to prevent them from going on and making profits. But only yesterday we passed a bill which involves at least \$350,000,000, according to the statement of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG]. We had to limit the time in order to pass that little bill.

I know that the large corporations in the country will attack anything we are trying to pass in this body which affects their interests. I know there is not a single paragraph in the Agricultural appropriation bill where it affects the packers which they do not oppose. I do not guess on this, because I have talked with them.

You may ridicule a provision in the bill appropriating a small amount to teach the farmers how to tan lace leather and other kinds of leather, but let me say to you that if conditions do not change the only way the farmers will get leather will be to tan it themselves. They will not have the money to pay \$3 a pound for lace leather tanned by the big packers.

Mr. President, this question deserves much more than simply ridicule. It involves the welfare of at least 7,000,000 farmers of

this country, because they all use this product more or less. I am somewhat sick and tired every time an item of this kind is brought before this body to hear some of these very able Senators, who are all friends of mine, attack it by ridiculing it. I very often myself ridicule things with which I am the least familiar, but I find by a careful study of the matters which I attempt to ridicule that they have merit in them.

I have no more interest in this item than anyone else, but the Senator from Utah is attacking this proposition. In his first statement he said, "Everybody knows about it now," and then when the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], who was deeply interested in it and who is really the father of the amendment, asked him for a recipe, the distinguished Senator from Utah was unable to give it.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President; the Senator from Utah can give a recipe very easily. It used to take a year, when the people first went to Utah, to tan a piece of leather, but that was absolutely necessary, as we could not get leather in any other way, and that is the length of time it will take the Senator from Louisiana with the processes to be investigated under this appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. Then perhaps the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Utah can get together, and if they can I will ask that this item be passed over. Perhaps we can save \$15,000.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I would like action on it now. I am afraid the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Louisiana would never get together on a simple, practical little item like this. We want it for the benefit of the farmers.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] suggests to me we could not get together unless it was on sugar. I do not know about that; but if that is the case, I am glad there is one thing on which the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Louisiana can get together.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether we could get together on sugar.

Mr. RANDELL. Well, I am a little disappointed then.

Mr. SMOOT. I, too, get a little tired, the same as the Senator from North Dakota gets a little tired, when he and other Senators take the floor and rant and rave about the industries of the country. As to this item, there will be no more competition with the packers than there would be for a baby a day old competing with a man in the full bloom of manhood. I do not know what the Senator from Louisiana wants to do, but if he thinks that leather is made the same as buckskin is made by the Indians, of course I have not any complaint to offer as far as he is personally concerned. His judgment may be that he can get something out of the appropriation of \$15,000. I have no doubt that perhaps there will be men visiting his city and stopping at hotels and drawing \$4 per diem, with a salary attached of \$1,800 or \$2,000. That would happen, and there is no doubt about that. So far as the results of their labors are concerned, little would come from them. I expect to live for at least a quarter of a century, but I have no more idea of ever seeing favorable results come from this appropriation than that I shall die to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 48, after line 25, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Chemistry from "\$944,561" to "\$973,061."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 26, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Chemistry from "\$1,275,251" to "\$1,303,751."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 6, to increase the appropriation for chemical investigations of soil types, soil composition, and soil minerals, the soil solution, solubility of soil, and all chemical properties of soils, etc., from "\$23,110" to "\$33,110."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 13, after the word "supply," to strike out the word "of" and insert "and methods of obtaining," so as to read:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply and methods of obtaining potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, \$86,840.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am very much surprised to see such an item in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Is not that amply taken care of by the appropriation for the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines? I know that both those branches of the Government are engaged in that work, and I can not see any possible use of the appropriation here.

Mr. SMOOT. Not only that, but we have our nitrate plant built now ready to operate. However, the item went in once and it must remain in the bill.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If it were not otherwise provided for I should say that the appropriation was a most commendable one, but we are engaging in a branch of work here, embarking the Agricultural Department in a line of investigation, that is certainly not appropriate at all to its functions and is peculiarly appropriate to the functions of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the Department of Agriculture have been making investigations in the same field. They were instructed to do so. In 1916 they made a report on the fertilizer situation and the report ought to be on the desks of Senators today, just submitted by the Department of Agriculture, showing the sources of supply and the materials entering into commercial fertilizers. They are actually making experiments.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Geological Survey have issued numerous bulletins concerning the supply of potash and nitrates in the country, many of which have been referred to from time to time on the floor here. Bear in mind, I commend the investigation as one that ought to be encouraged, but we are certainly embarking the Agricultural Department in investigations that are particularly appropriate to mining operations.

Mr. FLETCHER. In some respects it pertains to mining operations, but in other respects I think the investigation does not, because the Agricultural Department is making experiments now in the matter of developing potash, nitrates, and acids for reducing potash into sulphate of ammonia, ammonium potash, and so forth. I think they are doing a very important work in that line. I believe it will be well to keep it up for the present at least. I am sure that it is a splendid work.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, there was an appropriation carried several years ago in the Agricultural appropriation bill to enable the Department of Agriculture to determine the commercial value of kelp on the Pacific coast. They have made extensive investigations and their reports from time to time have given to the public full knowledge of the possibility of the different processes of obtaining potash from the kelp weed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator from South Carolina will permit me, that is entirely proper. Kelp is an agricultural product, it is a plant, and the chemists of the Bureau of Agriculture might very properly take into consideration the question of how they could extract from plants this useful basis of fertilizer. That, I think, might find some justification, but it is proposed here to conduct explorations for the purpose of locating deposits, mineral deposits, deposits of nitrate and of potash. I am a little surprised that phosphates, in which the Senator from Florida would be interested, are not included in this, except in the basket clause, as well as nitrates and potash. It seems to me that an appropriation to determine the availability of kelp, a plant, as a source of material for fertilizer would form no justification whatever to carry on mining explorations for the purpose of locating other sources of supply.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not understand that this means an investigation of the mining possibilities. As the Senator from Montana knows, the sources of supply of these ingredients are limited. Nitrates and potash are items that are not found in any great abundance like the phosphates are in the great mines in Florida and Tennessee. No investigation would improve that situation, because they are easily obtainable and in almost inexhaustible quantities. But the other two ingredients are more or less difficult to find.

As to the potash situation, I understand there is quite a source of potash obtainable from the by-products in the process of manufacturing sugar. There is also a considerable quantity of potash discovered in the process of reducing coal to coke. There are vast fields open for investigation in the legumes. As I understand the proposition, it is not to restrict nor to any great extent to go into the question of our mineral supplies, but it is the broad question of ascertaining where the supply may be obtained from other than and including that if they shall find it is profitable to do so.

I think the Senator from Montana will appreciate the fact that this is a field that is germane to the Department of Agriculture and in no sense would it necessarily duplicate the work of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and Mining. It leaves it open for them to find the ingredients, whether from a vegetable source or a mineral source, as they may have oppor-

tunity so to do. The kelp beds, the legumes, and other sources that would not fall within the field of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and Mining should be left open. In my opinion the appropriation should be granted.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from South Carolina correctly understands the situation if he intends to convey the impression that the appropriation means any work in connection with the study of the process of obtaining potash from kelp. That is covered by another item in the bill. There is a plant now operating in the State of California. Ample appropriation has been made for the study of that source, I am informed, at the top of the next page of the bill. I think the appropriation in the item under discussion is not even used for the purpose of studying the habits of the nitrates that may be obtained from leguminous plants. I think it is used perhaps in connection with some other department of the Government to ascertain and locate and work out certain mineral deposits in the Western States that may contain these elements. For instance, in the State of Utah and in the eastern part of the State of Oregon and in other Western States there are large deposits containing some of the nitrates, and I know that the Government, through this department, has been working with those minerals to ascertain if it is feasible to use the rock product and elements as a plant food. I think to that extent only is this contemplated, and I think the appropriation should be made for the very great service that the department is rendering the Government in that line.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no question at all that it is a duplication of work. The work ought to be done by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey. Those are the agencies that have the whole subject matter in charge. Potash deposits are frequently found on public lands, for instance.

Mr. FLETCHER. Neither of the services actually makes experiments, as I take it. They merely locate deposits and map and plat them, and that sort of thing, and show where the product possibly can be obtained, but the Department of Agriculture has a bureau which actually experiments with these different elements to determine the commercial value of the product.

Mr. SMOOT. The Bureau of Mines make experiments in every way, shape, and form. In the West they have a little experimental plant built in the State of Utah. There was a company formed in Utah for the purpose of extracting potash from the waters of the Great Salt Lake. I think they spent about \$600,000, but potash has dropped so now in price that all of their investment is lying idle. There is not a thing being done at that plant. Unless the price of potash increases, of course, they will lose all their money.

The Bureau of Mines was created for the very purpose of working out plans for the extraction of valuable minerals, and they are doing it successfully. They are doing it as far as nitrates are concerned. No one can secure title to a piece of land containing nitrates unless he complies with the laws of the United States. Not only that; a patent will never be issued, but a lease might be secured, but not until an examination and ascertainment is made of the value of it for minerals, and that examination is made by the Geological Survey. We have nearly all of the lands of the West classified now as to whether they are grazing lands or whether they are mineral lands, or whether they are agricultural lands, and each class can only be utilized by complying with the laws affecting each class of land.

The Bureau of Mines, I understand, have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the investigation of certain rock deposits in New Jersey for the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of extracting potash from the same. They had all sorts of experiments made, and I know they have done similar work as far as the West is concerned. Take the item of extracting oil from shale. Who is doing that work? The Congress is appropriating the money and giving the authority to the Bureau of Mines to do the work, and I think the Bureau of Mines is doing the work just as well as it is possible to be done. They have spent thousands of dollars in experimenting in extracting oil from shale. They spent thousands and tens of thousands of dollars in developing the nitrate deposits in America.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that Congress for many years has appropriated large sums of money for experimental plants to develop the potash industry, and especially the extraction of potash from kelp. This year there is no appropriation for that purpose, except \$5,000 to take care of the machinery. If the Senator will permit, I wish to show to the Senate the large sum of money that is being saved. The only paragraph of which I know in this bill that contains any reference to this particular subject is this item.

Mr. SMOOT. I understand that thoroughly. Let me ask the Senator, before he interrupts me, why is not the depart-

ment asking for an appropriation for investigations in regard to extracting potash from kelp?

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator that they are asking for an appropriation for that purpose. In the Book of Estimates, on page 169, it will be found that the department has made an estimate for \$208,500 for that purpose. If the Senator will allow me, I will say that there was an appropriation in 1919 of \$127,600 for that purpose; in 1920 there was a like amount; in 1921 there was appropriated \$192,900, and this year the estimate is for \$208,500. All these paragraphs have been combined; there is only this one appropriation of \$36,000, and an appropriation on the next page, which the Senator will observe, of \$5,000. That is only to take care of the machinery in the kelp plants. It seems to me that the least we can do is to give the department this one appropriation, for they certainly must have it.

I wish to say to the Senator that I have gone into this question quite thoroughly. The Department of Agriculture has some very able and distinguished scientists who are now working on the question of developing potash, and no one knows better than does the Senator from Utah how important that question is.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; but the Senator from Utah also knows that the Geological Survey has the best scientists that it can get in the world, and so has the Bureau of Mines, and they are doing exactly the same work.

So far as the extraction of potash from kelp is concerned, I am very glad that that appropriation has been eliminated. They have succeeded in producing potash from kelp, which is a vegetable substance, and nobody objected to that originally being in the Agricultural bill; but this item proposes to have the Agricultural Department enter the domain of the Bureau of Mines and of the Geological Survey.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator from Utah object to the appropriation? It is a House appropriation. The only amendment which the Senate committee made was to insert certain words.

Mr. SMOOT. When the time comes I hope that some Senator will move to strike out the whole provision.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I call the Senator's attention to a report which was just laid on our desks in reference to this subject?

Mr. SMOOT. I have a copy of that report.

Mr. FLETCHER. I knew the subject was going to come up this morning, and I asked to have the report distributed. It is a report from the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Senator will find, on page 16, just what has been done by the Department of Agriculture under the heading:

IV. A report on investigations made and results since the publication of Senate Document No. 262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, on January 26, 1916—

I find this statement:

When President Taft took cognizance of American dependence on Germany for all of the potash entering American fertilizers through serious difficulties which had arisen regarding contracts and prices between American manufacturers and the Government-controlled potash syndicate in Germany, Congress granted an appropriation for the Bureau of Soils to make investigations of the fertilizer resources of the United States, including a search for potash.

Following that is a statement which shows that they have done a very important work.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; they claim that they should have credit in connection with the work done at Searles Lake and also in connection with the extraction of potash from the salt waters of Nebraska; but I want to say to the Senator that they have done nothing in that respect that the scientists in the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines have not done.

Mr. FLETCHER. I take it they use all the information they can get from the Bureau of Mines and from the Geological Survey as well as from all other sources.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the trouble about it. There should be but one Government agency for the collection of this information, and there ought not to be any other source. There should be no further appropriations other than for that one source which should collect the information.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does not the Senator from Utah think that the matter of fertilizer is one which peculiarly pertains to the Department of Agriculture, determining the source of fertilizers, the elements which enter into plant food, and the way to develop them and to make them available for the producers of the food of the country on reasonable terms? That, it seems to me, belongs to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah believes that the great bulk of potash produced in the United States—and this statement will be true as to the future—has come from the extraction of potash or nitrates from the rocks which are found in the everlasting hills of the West. That whole question is in the hands

of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines. They have the scientists there, and they pay them for the purpose of making these investigations.

It seems to me that this work should not be placed under the Department of Agriculture, for the scientists in that department who have been educated to study questions relating to plant life, growth, and development, and other matters connected with products of the soil are not the proper ones to handle it. It takes men who have studied for years and years along a particular line, who have studied the geology of the country, and more than likely have spent their early lives in the mines of the West. It takes practical men, and when such men are hired by the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines, if we can not get the information from them, there is no need of the Government expending money to have a duplication of the work in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, reference has been made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the report just issued by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the resolution of the Senate No. 435, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to ascertain as nearly as possible, and to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, the following: The amount of commercial potash, nitrogen, and phosphoric acid available for fertilizer purposes, and the price of each of these articles as compared with the prices for 1913, as shown by data in the office or that can be secured without material expense.

Reference was made then to the report at page 16, from which I read, as follows:

The Bureau of Soils made a thorough investigation of surface indications of potash salts and nitrate of soda deposits in the Western States and a more general investigation of the salt deposits of the Northern States. These surveys, with the exception of Searles Lake and some of the smaller lakes, gave indications of no workable deposits of potash salts occurring as such or of nitrate of soda. The bureau reported, however, on the possibilities of the commercial production of potash from the giant kelps of the Pacific coast, the deposits of Searles Lake, Calif., the saline lakes of western Nebraska, the dust from cement mills and from blast furnaces, the feldspars, green sand marls, wool waste, alunite, beet-sugar waste, and distillery waste. The bureau pointed out that the commercial success of extracting potash from all of these sources at prewar prices depended upon the utilization of by-products.

Mr. President, if the Department of Agriculture did make any such investigation as that, the money expended on it was practically thrown away, because the Geological Survey had years ago undertaken and carried out with its able corps of assistants exactly that kind of an investigation. It has located as accurately as it can all of these deposits in the Western and Northwestern States, and the information they have obtained is available to any Member of Congress in bulletins of value published by the Geological Survey.

Now, with reference to Searles Lake, the deposits there have not only been made the subject of repeated reports by the Geological Survey, but investigations by Congress have been conducted time and again as to that remarkable deposit, and the information thus derived is available.

Mr. SMOOT. And special legislation was passed by Congress in order that the salt deposits there might be worked.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Precisely, and we need only to turn to the reports of the Bureau of Mines and of the Geological Survey to ascertain from that source that this work is being conducted by them. I refer to the last report of the Geological Survey, and I find among bulletins published during the year just passed, Bulletin No. 715-A, Potash Deposits in Spain, by H. S. Gale. A memorandum says:

Potash was discovered accidentally in the salt deposits of the Province of Barcelona, in the northeast corner of Spain, in 1912, though the salt deposits themselves had been known for a hundred years.

The memorandum proceeds with a brief description of what is contained in the bulletin.

Then, Bulletin 715-B, The Potash Deposits of Alsace, by H. S. Gale.

That bulletin describes the potash deposits of Alsace.

Turning now to the report I read as follows:

Field studies of reported deposits of potash and nitrate in the Pacific Coast States and in the Southwest, by H. S. Gale, L. F. Noble, and G. R. Mansfield, not only contribute to our knowledge of the potash and nitrate resources of the United States but combine to form an analytical determination of the physiographic, climatic, rock soil, and water conditions that control the mode of occurrence of nitrates and potash salts in the western Pleistocene and Recent lake basins.

Then turning to the report of the Bureau of Mines, on page 55 it appears that they are considering methods of securing potash. I read:

At the Berkeley station a study of methods used in potash recovery at Searles Lake was completed and a report was prepared.

At the Salt Lake City station laboratory experiments on the recovery of potash from the low-grade alunite ores of southern Utah showed that concentration and recovery by calcination, leaching, and

electrical precipitation was feasible. The Aluminum Potash Co. continued experimental work in the station laboratories, using the bureau's furnace, leaching plant, and electrical treaters.

So, Mr. President, the whole subject is being taken care of, and there is no occasion whatever, so far as I can see, of making this appropriation and turning the work over to the Agricultural Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to refer to the report to which the Senator from Florida has called our attention. If the Senator from Florida has read the report, he knows that while in this bill the appropriation for the extraction of potash from kelp is cut out, this report asks that it be continued; and what is the result? I ask Senators to read the report in full, but I want to call the attention of the Senate particularly to page 17:

When it was found that the giant kelps of the Pacific coast carried a high percentage of potash salts, surveys were made by the Bureau of Soils of the kelp beds lying in that coastal region of the United States and its Territory, Alaska. The enormous tonnage found represented a source of potash of great potential value. This material offered the possibility of valuable by-products obtainable with potash. Upon the outbreak of the war the facts established by the department were taken advantage of by private enterprises and a considerable number of plants were erected on the west coast, principally in southern California and Puget Sound, for the manufacture of potash from this material.

Potash now has declined in price. It went sky-high during the war. It was not a question of what the purchasers would pay; it was simply a question of getting the potash. The price went so high that they could extract it from the salt waters of the great Salt Lake, they could extract it from the brackish waters found in Nebraska, they could extract it from kelp, and they could extract it from almost any article in which potash was found, because when it was extracted the price of potash was so high that there was hardly a limit to the price paid.

I continue:

At the same time Congress appropriated money for the erection and operation by the Bureau of Soils of an experimental and demonstrational kelp-potash plant with a view to determining the commercial feasibility of producing potash and the by-products which can be gotten from kelp, and with the hope that this information could be established in time to enable the private concerns operating to so develop their processes that they could continue the manufacture of potash from kelp upon restoration of normal conditions.

As far as the price of potash is concerned, it is nearly back to normal conditions, and that develops the fact that they can not extract potash profitably from this source.

The early termination of the war made this impossible, but subsequent experiments in this demonstrational plant have established by-products of sufficient value to carry the manufacturing cost of the potash. The results as they now stand show the commercial feasibility of extracting potash from kelp with by-products and selling the potash, where freight rates are not prohibitive, in competition with potash from any other source.

While it is felt that the commercial feasibility of recovering by-products of sufficient value to carry the cost of extracting potash has been demonstrated, it is the desire of this bureau to continue the operation of this plant until the efficiency of these processes has been increased to the point where the economic features will persuade outside concerns to reenter the industry.

Then they ask for an appropriation. In this bill that appropriation has been cut out, and the appropriation that is left in the bill simply means a duplication of the work in the Bureau of Mines and in the Geological Survey.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a word more has been said on this subject by Dr. Whitney, who is Director of the Bureau of Soils.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a moment? The Senator from Utah says that the provision for continuing this kelp plant has been cut out. Is not that a mistake?

Mr. GRONNA. There is no appropriation for the continuation of the kelp plant. There is only an item of \$5,000 in the bill to take care of the machinery, but the \$208,000 asked for was cut out by the House.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, of course this appropriation for the care of the machinery is only to care for it until an opportunity is had to dispose of it. The situation, I take it, is that private enterprise is now invading the kelp field. There are manufactories of very considerable extent, one very large one at San Diego, Calif., and they conduct extensive operations. They have machines by which the kelp is cut out in the ocean, loaded by machinery upon scows, and transported to the plant; so that private enterprise is now engaged in the experimentation and development of this source of supply of nitrate, and it is not necessary for the Government to carry it on any longer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that may be true. That perhaps was the attitude of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is the reason why the appropriation was cut out, and the \$5,000 carried for maintenance; but, as showing the limitations which the Senator from Utah has placed

upon this item, I want to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to Dr. Whitney's testimony before the House committee:

There is the investigation of garbage as a source of fertilizer. Through the work of the Bureau of Soils city garbage has come into quite a prominent place as a fertilizing material. We contributed quite materially to that. We are still looking for deposits of nitrate of soda in this country. We have not very much reason for believing that we will get workable deposits, but we should continue the search. We are still looking for possible deposits of potash, and we are working on phosphates and the economic use of our phosphate-rock deposits. That is being carried on now under the item for fertilizer resources. These investigations have gone so far, they have gone to the point where they are about ready to be taken up by commercial interests. Because we have them in definite shape we want to have an appropriation now to finish the work.

There is a clear, positive statement of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils that this work is getting so nearly completed that it embraces subjects far afield from what the Senator from Utah was discussing. I think it would be a mistake, in the interest of the agricultural people of the country, to discontinue further investigation of this subject, which is so very important to the farmers of the country.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator a question. Is it not true that the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey do not handle at all the work to which he has referred?

Mr. McNARY. That is precisely my understanding; and all the private concerns engaged in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of fertilizer will profit by the investigations made by the Government.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, of course the question addressed to the Senator from Oregon by the Senator from Georgia draws out only a kind of a general statement; but what is the fact? This is an appropriation to locate sources of supply of potash and nitrates. The Geological Survey is undoubtedly conducting investigations for the purpose of locating those sources of supply.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In minerals.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; in minerals.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But not generally, outside of what would fall within the scope of geological and mining work.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; that is not quite true, I am able to say to the Senator, because the Bureau of Mines are obliged to carry on experimentations with respect to the manufacture of coke, and they are conducting experiments for the purpose of utilizing the gases escaping from coke ovens, and they are conducting experimentations in relation to smelting, for the purpose of utilizing the gases contained in the fumes that go up from the smelters, and all that kind of thing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As I understand, a line of work is being done by the Agricultural Department in this respect which the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey do not handle, theirs being more technically mining and mineral investigation.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is what I am looking for. If there is any such thing, I should like to know it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I was asking the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the Senator from Oregon gives the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of Soils, who tells just exactly what they are doing. He tells in the report to which I have invited your attention. Now, if there is any line of investigation, any field that they can occupy, that is not occupied by the other governmental establishments, I should think we ought to have it.

I referred to the report made by the Department of Agriculture just a day or two ago, to which the Senator from Florida has referred. They tell us in that report that they are conducting investigations in the regions out in the West and in the Northwest where it is supposed that deposits of potash and of nitrates might be found; and apparently the only other source suggested is the fumes arising from coke ovens and from smelters of various kinds, and that investigation undoubtedly is being conducted by the Bureau of Mines.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, would it be appropriate at this time to move to strike out the paragraph?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the committee amendments are first to be considered.

The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 50, line 23, after the words "agricultural lands," to insert "in the national forests," so as to read:

For examination of soils to aid in the classification of agricultural lands, in the national forests, in cooperation with other bureaus of the department and other departments of the Government, \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 20, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Soils from "\$314,375" to "\$324,375."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 21, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Soils from "\$393,615" to "\$403,615."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 24, after the word "nuts," to strike out "\$173,500" and insert "\$183,500, of which \$10,000 shall be immediately available," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, \$183,500, of which \$10,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if there is any special purpose for which this \$10,000 is to be used; and I will state to the Senator the reason why I ask the question.

I have received several telegrams from people in my State, and in other States in the West interested in apple production, in which they refer to the cutting out by the House of an appropriation of \$10,000 to take care of the codling-moth situation, and I wondered if the \$10,000 which the committee has put in here was intended to take care of that situation?

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Oregon will answer.

Mr. McNARY. It was the intention of the committee to care for the suggestion made by the Senator from Washington at another place, under the general subject of the destruction and study of the habits of moths, I think on page 54.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I remember that I spoke to the Senator with reference to taking care of this item there, yet when I saw the language in this place—"for investigation of insects affecting deciduous trees, orchards, vineyards, nuts, and so forth"—and then saw this appropriation of \$10,000, to be immediately available, I wondered if the committee, in considering the matter, was really intending to take care of that situation by this appropriation. I thought it would be a very good place to do it, and a very proper way to do it.

Mr. McNARY. I can say to the Senator from Washington that the committee thought it should be inserted on page 54, after line 16, which deals with the prevention of the spread of moths. That covers the subject of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth, and it was thought the codling moth might well come in there, and out of that appropriation, without increasing it a dollar, three pests would be cared for.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a notation made of that kind, and that is where I was intending to offer an amendment until I saw this provision.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator having this matter in charge if the increase of \$10,000, which is made immediately available, is not to cover a deficit that has already been made?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have the notes of the department here as to that.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator read them, please?

Mr. GRONNA. Which particular item is it to which the Senator refers?

Mr. SMOOT. For investigation of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts, at the bottom of page 52.

Mr. McNARY. That is for peach blight.

Mr. GRONNA. That is an additional amount for peach blight. It is for an insect investigation in the South and in California, wherever they raise peaches.

Mr. SMOOT. I expected that was what the money was to be used for; but what I wanted to know was whether this \$10,000, to be made immediately available, is not to take care of money they have already expended over and above what was appropriated last year?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if I may interject, I understand it is not for that purpose, but it is to be available immediately to be used for the extermination of the peach blight, which affects the tender leaves of peach trees along early in the spring, after the blossoming period; and that season is approaching in the Southern States and in California. The money was to be made immediately available, on the passing of this measure, so that it could be used in experimentation and study of the destruction caused by that blight.

Mr. GRONNA. I might say to the Senator from Utah that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] introduced a special bill appropriating \$10,000 for this purpose. But I will read what the department has to say on it:

It is understood that this item has already been covered by an amendment to H. R. 15812, an amendment introduced by Senator HARRIS, of Georgia, for investigation of peach insects in Georgia. An appropriation was originally requested by the department in order to undertake work against the plum curculio in Georgia. The situation is acute, and unless energetic measures are taken to meet it the pest will undoubtedly cause serious injury to the Georgia peach-growing industry.

So it can not be said to be a deficiency at all. It is for new work.

Mr. FLETCHER. Was not the estimate \$193,500?

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we ought to increase it by \$10,000.

Mr. SMOOT. It has been increased by \$10,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This additional \$10,000 was added to meet a recommendation of the Department of Agriculture on an appeal from the agricultural department of Georgia to give active help at once to meet insect attacks upon peach orchards. This provision making it immediately available was, I think, inserted at my request in the committee, and it was done in compliance with the request of the State authorities. The Department of Agriculture recommended it and the department of Georgia had brought to their attention the necessity for immediate action, the loss last year having exceeded \$2,000,000.

Mr. GRONNA. As I understand it, the work must be done now or there will be no crop this year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not go into it technically, but I read the appeal from the State and I read the report of the Department of Agriculture, and was satisfied it was entirely meritorious.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, all I wanted to know was that this \$10,000 was not added to the appropriation and made immediately available to cover a deficit. I will say to the Senator that that often happens. Departments spend all their appropriations, then they find themselves short ten, twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty thousand dollars, and in some appropriation made for that same specific purpose in the coming fiscal year they say so much shall be appropriated and made immediately available.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was not the case with reference to this appropriation. I presented the evidence from the agricultural department of the State and the peach growers' association, and I also called attention to the recommendation of the Agricultural Department here. They asked for more, but the view in my own State was that \$10,000 was all that could be used. They have raised a fund for the purpose also. The peach growers have raised a fund, and by supplementing that with the appropriation of \$10,000 the work can be done.

Mr. GRONNA. It is not for a deficiency; it is for new work. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 3, after the words "chinch bug," to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "\$200,000," "Provided, That not less than \$50,000 shall be used for investigating methods for the control and eradication of the grasshopper;" so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly, grasshopper, and the chinch bug, \$200,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$50,000 shall be used for investigating methods for the control and eradication of the grasshopper.

Mr. POMERENE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how he expects to control grasshoppers?

Mr. GRONNA. This is not a new question to those who have been unfortunate enough to have grasshoppers. Instead of \$50,000, we ought to have \$200,000.

Mr. POMERENE. I am calling attention rather to the phraseology than anything else. I believe in the eradication of the grasshopper; I believe in doing anything to destroy him, but why the word "control"? I move to strike out the words "control and," so that it will read: "Methods for the eradication of the grasshopper."

Mr. GRONNA. This is the language which is always used to provide appropriations for controlling and eradicating insects and pests. It is not new language at all. Of course, I have no serious objection to the Senator's amendment, if you can eradicate them. That is the only way you can control them.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I take issue with the chairman. I think it is proper language. When you control a pest you localize it, or keep it within a zone. That is all "control" means. If you can keep it in a particular district, so that it will not spread, you are controlling it, and the prevention of its spread is sometimes the most effective way of eradication.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows that we appropriated \$500,000 for the control and eradication of the corn borer, and no one found any fault with that. We are appropriating a large sum of money this year for the control of the corn borer.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not know whether the word "control" is proper or whether it was used. I am not finding fault with the appropriation here; I am simply calling attention to the phraseology.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not care anything about it, either one way or the other.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we have a great many grasshoppers in the State of Utah, and the only way to get rid of them is to get the men out to fight them and eradicate them. You can not do it by appropriating money and talking about it. You must just get out a machine and go to work in the field at the proper time, when they come, and drive them in the creek and drown them, or else drive them into a trench and cover them over, or catch them and burn them up. Those are the only methods by which you can eradicate them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 10, after the words "Argentine ant," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$175,000," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$175,000, of which sum \$25,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 12, after the word "forests," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$65,000," and also the following proviso: "*Provided*, That \$25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States, counties, municipalities, or with private owners," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting forests, \$65,000: *Provided*, That \$25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with States, counties, municipalities, or with private owners.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I would like to inquire why this amendment is inserted?

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Oregon to explain it to the Senator from Delaware. It was his amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I offered the amendment in the committee for the purpose of meeting a very serious situation which obtains in the Pacific Coast States. Recently a new bug has appeared in the forests, known as the pine beetle. It is found in the national forests to a very large extent. I have sufficient data to convince the Senator from Delaware that this beetle is doing more to destroy the mature and partially mature forests of the West than any other insect or any other cause, save the loss by fire.

A few years ago this beetle was not known, but now it is a very common infestation; in fact, 15 per cent of the trees of the forests of the West are infected with this disease. Private industry is doing a tremendous lot to control the disease and to eradicate it. This appropriation is to be used in cooperation with private institutions, individuals, and States in the eradication of the pine beetle upon Government land.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The language is:

That \$25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to forest trees on and near the national forests.

It struck me, upon the reading, that this was a proposition to appropriate Federal money to protect forest trees of private individuals, and why should the Government do that?

Mr. McNARY. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that the term "national forests" does not include the Indian reservations and other places owned by the Government. In the southern part of Oregon are to be found some of the finest agricultural lands in the world. That is found not in the national forests but on the Indian reservations, and I think the Senator can recall, on a moment's reflection, how near an Indian reservation comes to being governmental property.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, yes; but may I ask the Senator if it is the purpose of this amendment to have the money spent only upon forests that are on Government property?

Mr. McNARY. The Senator must well know, on further reflection, that when the private interests are spending more money than the Government to prevent the spread from the forests owned privately to the Government forests it becomes a national enterprise.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did not catch that.

Mr. McNARY. I say, private interests are spending thousands of dollars to eradicate and control the pine beetle and other pests which affect the forests, and if it is discovered on private property, the Government will join with the private individuals to prevent it from spreading to the Government forests.

In the fire-prevention provision of this bill, and all other agricultural appropriation bills which have come before Congress for years, the Government, in cooperation with the States and individuals, has expended thousands of dollars to prevent the spread of fires on private lands; upon the theory that that is protecting directly the national forests, and protecting one of the great resources of the country. So, in this instance, when there is infestation on private land located near Government land, it is proper for the Government to cooperate with the individuals to prevent the spread of this injurious beetle to the Government forests. It is an assurance against great destruction, and that is the reason upon which a provision of this kind is founded.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can very readily see, then, some rather plausible reason for the insertion of the amendment. When the Senator stated to me that the forests on which it was proposed to spend the appropriation were forests upon Indian reservations, and therefore upon Government property, and the appropriation therefor eminently proper, it seems to me he was not exactly representing the whole situation, because it turns out upon further inquiry from the Senator that it is contemplated that some of the money shall be spent to do work upon private property. There may be some justification for that in the reason the Senator has suggested, namely, that the private property is contiguous to the Government-owned property.

Mr. McNARY. Let me call the Senator's attention to an appropriation which follows, a part of which is undoubtedly used in his State, for preventing the spread of moths, \$400,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But the sum appropriated in the amendment to which I am referring is only \$25,000.

Mr. McNARY. I am calling the Senator's attention to an item on page 54, to prevent the spread of moths, all of which money is used in the Eastern States on privately owned lands, the appropriation being \$400,000. Has the Senator any objection to that item? Does he desire to change the policy of the Government?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator certainly can not understand English if he confuses such language as that. The language in the paragraph on page 54, starting with line 16, is:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the continued spread of the gypsy and brown-tail moths, by conducting such experiments as may be necessary to determine the best methods of controlling these insects.

Whereas the amendment he is seeking to have incorporated asks the United States Government to spend money to fight, by fumigation or whatnot, insects on private property.

Mr. McNARY. I will state to the Senator from Delaware that if he understood the proposition he would not make that statement.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand what has been referred to.

Mr. McNARY. That provision refers to localizing the gypsy moth, which is infesting privately owned shrubbery and trees in the East and is something to be eradicated by spraying, but no one is advocating the saving of the wonderful forests in the West by spraying.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know the method. The Senator is proposing an appropriation of \$25,000, not to study methods of exterminating the pest, but to spend \$25,000 to prevent and combat the pest. If this were an appropriation of \$25,000 for the purpose of investigating methods of exterminating the pest, then the appropriation would be in entire harmony with the whole scheme of the pest investigation.

I will state what prompted me to make the inquiry. There is an item in the bill "for investigations of insects affecting deciduous fruits, orchards, vineyards, and nuts." My contention is that the amendment under consideration should be worded the same, and not "for preventing and combating infestations of insects." There is another item for the investigation of insects affecting truck crops, and an item for the investigation of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, and so forth, but when we come to the amendment under consideration we find "that \$25,000 shall be used for preventing and combating infestations of insects." In the other cases the appropriation is for studying methods to combat, but when we come to these insects attacking the forests we are asked to appropriate money not for the purpose of investigating methods to combat the insects, but to appropriate \$25,000 for the purpose of preventing and combating infestations and to provide that the Government may do so in-

dependently or in cooperation with States, counties, municipalities, or private interests.

Therefore, it occurs to me that this particular appropriation is somewhat out of line with the whole series of appropriations. I can see why the United States Government, if it has a valuable forest or reservation, should in the protection of its property perhaps go on the property of private individuals and spend some money combating the advance of an insect which, if it comes over on the Government property, will cause an impairment of Government values there. But at the same time the Government is protecting its property, it is doing a benefit to the private individual who owns the adjoining property, and why should not that private individual pay something, too?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Montana? Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think, if the Senator will reflect, he will find no objection whatever to the appropriation. Out West we are obliged to combat destructive forest fires. There is a forest fire raging in the vicinity in which I have some property, for instance. It is not on my property at all, but it may reach there, and so I join with all my neighbors and we throw in together and establish a fund and go out to put out that fire. It is not raging on our properties or on the property of any of us, but nevertheless we have contributed. So the Government of the United States contributes jointly with the States and individual owners of property to extinguish forest fires lest they should destroy property of the Government.

So with the insect pests. They spread, they multiply, they are upon property adjacent to the national forests, property regarded as highly valuable. If they are allowed to spread without restriction, they will undoubtedly eventually embrace and include in their devastations the forests belonging to the Government upon the forest reserves. Why is it not entirely proper for the Government to make an appropriation to join with sums appropriated by the owners of private lands and by the States, the owners of lands also, to combat this peril?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will say that exactly the last reasoning of the Senator has occurred to me, and I do not take issue with him, but I wish to call the Senator's attention to one fact. This is not a proposition that the Government must, if it does anything at all, cooperate with these particular bodies, because the language is that the Government may independently of private owners do this work. I say, regardless of the high opinion I have for the Senator's judgment, that if the United States Government is going to go out and clean up the forest lands of private parties of an infectious insect, that while it is protecting itself and benefiting itself, it is doing a great good to the private party and it ought to be a cooperative scheme. Therefore I desire to move to eliminate from the amendment the words "independently or," and make it purely a cooperative situation.

Mr. McNARY. If that amendment should prevail it would prevent the Government from exterminating the beetle on its own land.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let the Government fight it when it gets on its own lands, then. If private parties have forests and will not help the Government exterminate the beetle until it advances, then let it eat up the private forests and let the Government fight it when it gets on the Government property.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to state to the Senator from Delaware that it affects thousands and millions of trees on Government lands of the West to-day, and in fighting the amendment he is causing a great loss to the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not attacking the amendment. I am sure the amendment will go through, regardless of what I may say or do. The Senator stated that private parties have spent a great deal of money in this work. What I object to is that they do not spend it in cooperation with the Government.

Mr. McNARY. That shows the Senator's spirit. A spirit is found in the West in all these cooperative movements which can not be found in all the States of the East. I have a letter from the Klamath County Chamber of Commerce, in Oregon, where Government timber is located, from which I read:

The timbermen state that investigations covering this country show that from 1 to 10 per cent of the standing timber is being destroyed and that the ravages of this pest are rapidly gaining. For instance, in 10 years preceding 1918 there was perhaps 6 per cent of the timber killed, while during the last 2 years the amount has been increased to 15 per cent. The timbermen state that they are willing to take care of the destroying of this pest on their own land, but that this work is almost useless unless they receive the cooperation of the Government on the Government lands and on the Indian reservations and the national forest reserves.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the chairman of the committee if the appropriation is estimated for?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I find that there was an estimate for \$67,000. I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware if it is his understanding that the amount appropriated for the eradication of the corn borer is not expended on private lands and that it is only for the study of it and not for the actual eradication of the insect?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The language of the corn-borer appropriation is:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the spread of the European corn borer, and to provide means for the control and prevention of spread of this insect throughout the United States, in cooperation with the States concerned, including employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$275,000.

The language there is "in cooperation with States concerned." I am asking that this appropriation be put on the same basis. Let it be done in cooperation with private owners. I am not opposing the idea of the appropriation going through, but let it be put on the same terms with other appropriations in the same category. I object to the words "independently or" in this particular appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator must know that this is a different situation. A large portion of the appropriations will, of course, be expended in the national forests, but suppose there is vacant Government land adjoining a national forest not owned by individuals but owned by the National Government? That would not be a national forest; and there are hundreds of thousands of such cases as that. I am really surprised that the Senator from Delaware should criticize the language. Of what value would it be to the forests if the Federal Government should destroy the insects in the national forests and then have them attacked again by the same class of insects located on the lands surrounding them, either other Government lands or privately owned lands?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is entirely proper. I will say to the Senator, for the Government to be allowed to spend money on the forests and upon Indian lands owned by the Government adjoining forest reservations. I would not object to a change to that effect.

Mr. GRONNA. What about Government lands?

Mr. WOLCOTT. What I am objecting to is that the language leaves it open for the Government of its own accord to spend money to eradicate the pest on privately owned lands. That is all I am objecting to. I want to make it so as to keep it particularly within the idea that the Government shall make expenditures on its own property, or, if it does it on property owned by private individuals, they shall bear some part of the expense. Therefore I move to strike out the words "independently or."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I believe—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not know the Senator from North Dakota had the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to suggest that it does not seem possible that a case could arise where there would not be cooperation in this work, for an individual owning a forest adjoining a national forest or a Government reservation would certainly be willing to cooperate with the Government to the extent of his own labor and time anyway. This leaves it wide open for the Government to say what sort of cooperation it will require. I do not believe the Senator from North Dakota would find that striking out the words "independently or" would hamper the operation of the section.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have some further amendments which I desire to offer if the amendment to the amendment now being considered should be adopted.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Delaware is evidently not familiar with the conditions in some of the Western States. There are still Government lands, and perhaps on some of those Government lands are homestead settlers, but the land still belongs to the Government until the claims have been proven up.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that eliminating the words "independently or" from the amendment would not prevent the employment of these funds for combating pests on other Government-owned land; that is to say, on Indian-reservation land.

Mr. GRONNA. But a national forest is one thing and Government land is another.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand, but the elimination of the words I am suggesting would not prevent the employment of this money for combating pests on Government lands at any time.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that it might if the lands were held by homestead settlers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the title to the land which the homestead settlers occupy is still in the Government, then, I say to the Senator, he is wrong in his point of view, because the language of the amendment is:

* * * for preventing and combating infestations of insects injurious to trees on and near the national forests.

I have moved to amend by striking out the words immediately following "independently or"—

in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government—

And so forth.

The money may still be spent "in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government" under the express terms of the amendment. So, with all due deference to the Senator's judgment, I think he is in error when he thinks that eliminating the words which I suggest to strike out would prevent the expenditure of money on other Government-owned lands within the national forests.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Senator from Delaware; I know he is a good lawyer, and, as a common, ordinary hayseed, I dislike to oppose him or to put up my judgment against his; but I am more familiar with this situation than is the Senator from Delaware.

Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that we are appropriating in this bill \$400,000—for what? For the control and eradication of insect pests on Government land? No; but on lands in the New England States for the control and eradication of the gypsy moth and the brown-tail moth. The bill also carries \$100,000 for the white pine blister rust. Where is white pine blister rust found? In the New England States. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate increased the appropriation for white pine blister rust to \$214,000. So I will say to the Senator that I hardly think we can split hairs as to the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" when it comes to small appropriations of \$25,000 for the protection of national forests. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be voted down, and that the committee amendment may then be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Wolcott] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. In the next item, beginning in line 19, on page 53, when it is in order, I propose to submit an amendment increasing the appropriation from \$110,000 to \$150,000. I am calling attention to the clause now, and I will ask the chairman of the committee in the meantime to consider the amendment which I intend to propose. I think a mistake has been made by confining the appropriation to the sum of \$110,000. As I have stated, the amendment is not now in order, but when it is in order I am going to move to increase the appropriation from \$110,000 to \$150,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only committee amendments are in order at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that, but I wanted to give the notice of my intention to move to amend the text of the bill in that respect at the proper time.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 54, line 2, after the word "subtropical," to strike out "plants" and insert "fruits, including plants," and in line 5, after the word "Board," to strike out "\$51,500" and insert "\$60,000," so as to read:

For investigations of insects affecting citrus and other tropical and subtropical fruits, including plants, and for investigations and control of the Mediterranean and other fruit flies and the camphor thrip, in cooperation with the Federal Horticultural Board, \$60,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like a word of explanation regarding the proposed amendment which has just been stated, from which it appears that some insect is interfering with the production of camphor.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. Fletcher] to give a satisfactory explanation of the amendment to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the insect referred to in this amendment, the camphor thrip, is one which threatens the young camphor trees as they grow up. It is something on the same order as the white fly, the black fly, and insects of that kind, which attack the leaves and the body of the young trees. The camphor industry has gotten to be quite an important one. As the Senator from Colorado knows, we have been very largely dependent on Formosa and Japan for camphor.

Mr. THOMAS. We produce it now synthetically.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is now being produced synthetically to a considerable extent; but in Florida we have several groves of 2,000 or 3,000 acres, and I believe one contains 10,000 acres, where they are producing the trees. They clip the young growth of the tree each year and distill from that the gum. They do not cut down the tree, as is done in Japan, and distill the tree itself, but they clip off the young growth each year and distill that, so as to make the camphor gum. That has got to be quite an important industry. The camphor thrip is an insect which has appeared and which is seriously threatening the growth of the industry. The State, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, and private industry are cooperating with the Government. A very small portion of this appropriation goes to the investigation of the camphor thrip. I think the estimate was for \$66,500 for the items covered by the paragraph.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not objecting to it; but I was a little curious to know what it meant.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the estimate was for \$66,500. I will ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think we ought to increase the appropriation to \$66,500? The committee has only raised the House appropriation by \$8,500.

Mr. GRONNA. No; I do not think we should increase the appropriation. The committee considered this matter very carefully and was unanimously of the opinion, as I remember, that the \$60,000 would be sufficient for this year.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing to abide by the judgment of the committee, although I really think they should have made it \$66,500.

Mr. THOMAS. It seems to have been a narrow escape for me. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 54, line 10, after the word "insects," to strike out "\$52,330" and insert "\$70,000: *Provided*, That \$17,000 shall be used for investigations of the blow fly and screw worm," so as to read:

For investigations, identification, and systematic classification of miscellaneous insects, including the study of insects affecting the health of man and domestic animals, household insects, and the importation and exchange of useful insects, \$70,000: *Provided*, That \$17,000 shall be used for investigations of the blow fly and screw worm.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 15, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Entomology from "\$795,670" to "\$906,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 22, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology from "\$1,599,940" to "\$1,710,450."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 11, after the word "appropriated" in line 10, to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500"; and in line 11, after the word "expended," to insert "of which \$2,500 shall be used for the construction of new buildings," so as to read:

For the improvement and maintenance of the game preserve in Sullys Hill National Park, in the State of North Dakota, including the construction of all fences, sheds, buildings, corrals, roads, shelters, and other structures which may be necessary for the protection of game or for the use of visitors, in addition to the amount heretofore appropriated, \$7,500, the same to be available until expended; of which \$2,500 shall be used for the construction of new buildings.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 20, after the words "ground squirrels," to insert "jack rabbits"; and, in line 24, after the word "animals," to strike out "\$452,240" and insert "\$550,000," so as to read:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry, and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, \$550,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 7, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Biological Survey from "\$714,755" to "\$815,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 8, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Biological Survey from "\$795,825" to "\$896,085"; also on page 59, line 14, before the words "of class 4," to strike out "4" and insert "5"; in line 15, before the words "of class 1," to strike out "13" and insert

"14"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," in line 16, to strike out "\$51,220" and insert "\$54,020," so as to read:

Salaries, Division of Accounts and Disbursements: Chief of division and disbursing clerk, \$4,000; supervising auditor, \$2,250; cashier and chief clerk, \$2,250; deputy disbursing clerk, \$2,000; accountant and bookkeeper, \$2,000; clerks—2 of class 4, 5 of class 3, 7 of class 2, 14 of class 1, two at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$720; messenger boy, \$600; in all, \$54,020.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it is about time to stop increasing the number of employees in the departments. In the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, in which the salaries of a great majority of the employees are provided for, we tried to begin to retrench a little and cut off employees where that was possible, and in no case did we add to their number. I know, of course, that the head of the Division of Accounts and Disbursements will ask for more clerks and will continue so to do just so long as the Government lasts; but really does not the Senator believe that we ought to decrease the number of employees in the District of Columbia? There are about 87,000 of them now, whereas before the war the number ran from forty to forty-three thousand.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am in perfect accord with the Senator from Utah, and he knows from my work on the Committee on Appropriations with him, that I make every effort possible to save every dollar that can be saved; but this item—and I want to be frank with the Senator—is for Mr. Zappone. He can not possibly do the work unless the additional help is given him. I sent a special representative to his division, and I am absolutely certain from the information that was brought to me that the additional employees are necessary. They were estimated for, but were not allowed in the House. I hesitated, and the committee hesitated, to insert the provision, but after investigation it was found that it was necessary. I do not believe it is economy to deny the head of this division the proper help; I believe it is rather in the interest of economy to grant him what he needs. The Senator knows that there ought to be a reorganization of all the executive departments and that it is a difficult matter for us to do in these particular places; but until the general reorganization is brought about we must give the head of this division the help which is absolutely required.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, nobody wants to deprive any department of the help that is really required, but that does not mean to give them what they ask for. If we gave all the departments of the Government the number of clerks which they ask we would have 150,000 employees in the District of Columbia. We will never get rid of any of them so long as we continue to appropriate for them; that is one thing sure. I thought now that conditions are getting back to normal, the war having been over for two years and a half, that we ought, while providing an adequate number of employees, to make those who are employed do a fair day's work.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I wish to say for Mr. Zappone that during the present winter he and his force have, to my knowledge, worked as late as 2 o'clock in the morning. I know that to be a fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Was that for once or more than once?

Mr. GRONNA. Oh, no; that happens very frequently. There is a tremendous amount of work for these men to do.

Mr. SMOOT. What has caused that extra work, I will ask the Senator?

Mr. GRONNA. There is nothing new about it. These men have been overworked not only during this session of Congress, but during the last session of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I am going down to that division of the department, for I should like to see it.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will do so.

Mr. SMOOT. If what the Senator says is true, it is the only place under the Government departments that I know anything about where the employees are overworked.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator knows I would not state it if it were not so.

Mr. SMOOT. I take the Senator's statement for granted, and that is the reason I am going down there, because I should like to see one department of our Government whose clerks are overworked. I do not know but that it would take my breath away to find such a condition. I know that I got a letter the other morning saying that when I entered one of the departments the other day a man who stood at the door immediately telephoned to every division there, "Get to work, and be at your typewriters. Senator Smoot is coming."

Mr. President, I know one division of our Government where it is absolutely true that the ladies of the department made their trousseaus in the office during working hours. If the work is to be done in the same way that it is now going on, and there

is to be no change, we might just as well make up our minds that we can double the number of employees. Washington is a delightful place to live in. Girls receiving salaries of sixteen and eighteen hundred dollars, with a \$240 bonus, have plenty of time to go to the theater and do fancy work during working hours. Who would want to give it up?

I am glad, however, to hear the Senator from North Dakota say that in this division it is different. I think if they are we ought to make special provision for them and give everyone of them a chromo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 59, line 20, in the items for salaries for Division of Publications, to insert "assistant editor, \$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 17, to increase the salaries for the Division of Publications from "\$252,180" to "\$254,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 20, after the numerals "\$11,380," to insert "of which sum \$3,000 shall be used for salaries of employees engaged in the distribution of bulletins," so as to read:

For extra labor and emergency employments in the District of Columbia, \$11,380, of which sum \$3,000 shall be used for salaries of employees engaged in the distribution of bulletins.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that I have to ask a question about this amendment, due to the fact that I could not attend the later meetings of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. What is the nature of the work of these employees with respect to distribution? The amendment says "engaged in the distribution of bulletins."

Mr. GRONNA. This does not increase the appropriations, as the Senator will observe, but it is for the purpose of furnishing extra help to distribute the bulletins. As it is to-day, what may be called picture shows have been held. I have no objection to that if it does not cost too much money and if it is for the purpose of educating the people throughout the country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. These people are employed in the District of Columbia, however, are they not?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; these people are employed in the District of Columbia, and for that reason the committee saw fit to direct that so much money shall be used for this particular purpose, because we thought it would be of more benefit to the people all over the country to get these bulletins, and to have the extra help required to distribute them, than to have these shows that I have mentioned.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I see. Then, as I understand, these people would be employed in keeping track of the mailing lists, folding, and sending out bulletins?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; that is what the amendment is for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 61, line 24, to increase the total appropriation for Division of Publications from "\$380,110" to "\$382,110."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, line 12, after the words "District of Columbia," to strike out "\$61,500" and insert "\$81,500," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of the above acts and the act approved May 8, 1914, entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," relative to their administration and for the administration of agricultural experiment stations in Alaska, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the island of Guam, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, including the employment of clerks, assistants, and other persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere, freight and express charges, official traveling expenses, office fixtures, supplies, apparatus, telegraph and telephone service, gas, electric current, and rent outside of the District of Columbia, \$81,500.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator why that increase is granted?

Mr. GRONNA. The increase is to take care of certain matters in the dependencies. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] can explain the need for it better than I can. Some of it goes to the island of Guam, I believe, but I think most of it goes to the Virgin Islands. I will turn to the estimates.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I do not understand that most of it goes to the Virgin Islands.

Mr. GRONNA. I refer to the increase.

Mr. KENYON. The appropriation was raised last year to enlarge the experiment station in the Virgin Islands. I do not remember now whether it was \$5,000 or \$10,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee. The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 68, line 24, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the States Relations Service from "\$4,640,980" to "\$4,660,980."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 25, to increase the total appropriation for the States Relations Service from "\$4,837,300" to "\$4,857,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 3, before the word "draftsman," to strike out "one," and in line 11, before the word "mechanician," to strike out "one," so as to read:

Salaries, Bureau of Public Roads: Chief of bureau, \$6,000; purchasing agent, \$2,500; draftsman or clerk, \$1,920; clerks or editorial clerks—1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,200; clerks or photographers—1 \$1,440, 1 \$1,200, 1 \$1,000; clerk or instrument maker, \$1,200; clerk or skilled laborer, \$1,000; instrument maker, \$1,800; model maker, \$1,800; clerks—1 \$1,900, 4 of class 4, 7 of class 3, 3 at \$1,500 each, 6 of class 2, 9 at \$1,320 each, 7 of class 1, 4 at \$1,100 each, 2 at \$1,000 each; mechanic, \$1,680; mechanics—1 \$2,100, 1 \$1,800, 1 \$1,500, 1 \$1,200; skilled laborer, \$1,200; skilled laborer or mechanic, \$840; laboratory aid, \$960; telephone operator, \$720; mimeograph operator, \$840; 2 laborers at \$900 each; messengers or laborers—2 at \$840 each, 2 at \$660 each, 4 at \$600 each; 4 messengers, laborers, or laboratory helpers at \$720 each; fireman, \$720; messenger boys—3 at \$600 each, 8 at \$480 each; 11 charwomen at \$240 each; in all, \$114,460.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, is not the word "one" necessary there? It says in the case of the first amendment "draftsman or clerk," and I notice that a number of them read in the same way.

Mr. GRONNA. That was a mistake of the printing office. We just struck out the word "one."

Mr. SMOOT. I presume it will amount to the same thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 70, line 11, to increase the appropriation for inquiries in regard to systems of road management and economic studies of highway construction, operation, maintenance, etc., from "\$50,000" to "\$61,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 9, to increase the appropriation for investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation, including the best methods to apply in practice, etc., from "\$62,440" to "\$72,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the \$72,000 appropriated for investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation belongs under the Bureau of Public Roads? This appropriation and the one at the bottom of page 71 and the one at the top of page 72 are all printed under that heading in the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. In the totals, too.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and they are in the totals.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that it seems that these items have been carried under the heading "Bureau of Public Roads."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the director of the bureau supervise this work in farm irrigation?

Mr. GRONNA. I presume he does.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is he supposed to know about it?

Mr. GRONNA. It would take quite a while to tell the Senator what he is supposed to know about it. The Senator was present last year when the Agricultural bill was taken up, and he will remember how very much the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] was interested in this very item. He considered it very valuable and of very great importance. I confess that I do not know as much about it as other Senators do, but it is not a new item. It has been carried in the bill for a number of years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I realize it is not a new item.

Mr. McNARY. I think the criticism of the Senator from New York goes to the propriety of carrying it under this head.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. I want to know who supervises this work.

Mr. McNARY. It comes under the Bureau of Public Roads. That may be unfortunate. It is for arid lands, where water is

not available. We often impound water in large reservoirs in the mountains. It is for the purpose of discovering water veins and bringing them to the surface and irrigating dry lands. It is an increase of \$9,500 over the House appropriation. A wonderful work is being done in some of the semiarid States, and it was thought that it should be continued. Possibly it is unfortunate that it comes under this head, but it would be more unfortunate, in my judgment, knowing something of western conditions, if this item should be decreased or omitted from the bill. But I repeat that I think the objection of the Senator from New York is as to its location in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. All this money is spent under the Bureau of Public Roads. It is only another example of the duplication of work that is going on. I do not think Senators know that we have 27 engineering divisions in our Government instead of having one. I hope the reorganization commission will rectify some of it, but I do not know how long, even if it is rectified, it will remain so. Somebody on the Committee on Agriculture thought they wanted a little more money for the utilization of water on farms in farm irrigation, and this is about the only place they could put it in this bill, and therefore it went in under the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Utah, who certainly is conversant with western irrigation projects, if he thinks the chief engineer of the Reclamation Service should do this work on farms rather than the Bureau of Farm Management in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. SMOOT. This subject ought to be under the Interior Department. All of it ought to be appropriated for under that department and all of it ought to be done by one engineering board.

Mr. McNARY. That may be true, but it is not so handled.

Mr. SMOOT. I know it is not, and that is why I am complaining about it.

Mr. McNARY. Does the Senator want to stop a good and meritorious work simply because it is not classified as he thinks it should be?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I want to take it out of this place and put it where it belongs, not having two different bureaus, with different employees, making different reports about the same project. The Senator from New York is perfectly right in asking the question as to why this is under the Public Roads Bureau. It never ought to be there. It ought to be under the Interior Department, and the appropriations ought to be made under that department, and they should be increased, if necessary, to cover the work; but the work should be done under the control of one department.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, perhaps both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Utah are right, that it ought to be done in the Department of the Interior; but it is not done there. This is an increase of only \$9,500 over the bill as passed by the House, and I want to read what the department has to say with reference to this item:

The States are also contributing funds and cooperating with the department, and this fact is indicative of the practical value of these investigations to the States which have to depend largely upon irrigation for the production of foodstuffs. The Department of Agriculture is the only Federal agency engaged in research work in irrigation practices and methods. Studies of the movement of soil moisture so far made have revealed the fact that there is a great dearth of information regarding this subject. These investigations, the results of which are of such great practical value to the irrigation farmer, should be resumed and extended. In the past several years an investigation of the flow of water in various forms of irrigation conduits has been made to determine the friction losses, the results of which have had valuable application to irrigation systems. These studies so far have covered irrigation canals, wood pipe, and concrete pipe, and should be enlarged to include various kinds of metal pipes and flumes. Problems in the handling of silt-laden irrigation water and the removal of silt deposits should be investigated, and greater attention should be given to the proper design and economical operation of pumping plants.

I think that is a justification for it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I can go now to the public-document room and get reports from the Reclamation Service, from the Forest Service, and from the Geological Survey, and in those reports will be found statements that they are making just such examinations as are recorded here. Who is there from the West who does not know that the Forest Service have had men taking the flow of the streams every day in the month for years and years past? Who is there who does not know that the question of the friction caused in a water power pipe line is not being considered by the Reclamation Service, and also now by the Water Power Commission?

Mr. GRONNA. This is for the whole country.

Mr. SMOOT. So are the other appropriations for the whole country. It can only apply, however, where there is irrigation.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator where he wants it placed in the bill, then, if it is in the wrong place?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not in the proper bill. But I am not going to propose a change now. I hope, however, that some time

or other we will have a complete reorganization and prevent the granting of appropriations to three or four different departments to do exactly the same work. It is too costly. If the Senator ran his farm or his bank or his business that way, he would go broke; and there is no difference between the business of a Senator of the United States and the Government of the United States, except as to the size and the resources. I want to say that the way we are going now, Mr. President, in dividing up the work that ought to be done by one department into four or five, perhaps the Government will go broke in the end.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the Senator from Utah, is there any means available for this in the reclamation fund? What is the purpose of that fund? It is to bring water on the land, and not to study these farm problems, which properly come under farm management.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, every reclamation project is gone into thoroughly before it is ever recommended by the Reclamation Service. They stay upon every stream, they gauge it for years and years. I can go into the Reclamation Service to-day and find a record of the flow of every stream they have ever recommended for reclamation projects for the last 20 years.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah shows again that he is not familiar with the purpose of this amendment. I think I know as much about one subject as he does, and that is reclamation, and how it is practiced in the West; and I say to the Senator with absolute confidence and certainty that there is no work done by the Reclamation Service comparable to this work outlined here, which carries \$72,000.

Mr. BORAH. What is this work?

Mr. SMOOT. To determine the flow of water.

Mr. McNARY. Let the Senator from Utah tell the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. McNARY. I have yielded to higher and more experienced authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply desire to say, Mr. President, that the chairman of the committee read a statement from an official of the Government what this appropriation was for and what was to be done with it, and that showed that it was for ascertaining the flow of water in the streams; and I say that not only does the Reclamation Service collect that information and have it at the disposal of every citizen of the United States who may ask for it, but so has the Forest Service and so has the Geological Survey.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Reclamation Service collect this data outside of the arid region?

Mr. SMOOT. This is only for irrigation purposes. It says:

For investigating and reporting upon the utilization of water in farm irrigation.

So it could be only where there was irrigation.

Mr. BORAH. There is no motion to transfer it, is there?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not at all.

Mr. McNARY. Farm irrigation, as it is practiced, includes grouping of farms into units known as irrigation districts. That is one kind of farm irrigation about which these studies are made. This item includes farm irrigation on the farm as a unit, where the water can not be brought upon it through reservoirs or conduits, but must be had through springs or through the piping of water from the direct flow of rivers and streams or the boring of wells. It is a different proposition, not comprehended in any way under the general scheme of reclamation by the Secretary of the Interior or his subordinates, and is properly a function of the Department of Agriculture, in my judgment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the sundry civil appropriation bill which has just passed this body there was an appropriation made specifically for boring wells in the arid States of the West. The first appropriation made for that purpose was in the State of Nevada, and the appropriations have grown from that time, so that it covers all of the intermountain States—that is, the semiarid States of the West. The money is being used for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 11, to insert:

For supervising the preparation, distribution, and use of picric acid, trinitrotoluol, trojan powder, and such other surplus war explosives as may be made available for use in clearing stumps and stones from agricultural land, independently or in cooperation with agricultural colleges and other agencies, and for investigating and reporting upon the results obtained from the use of the explosives, \$15,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill why the word "preparation," in line 12, was inserted?

Mr. GRONNA. This item was inserted at the request of the Senators from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan. As I understand it, there are large quantities of explosives owned by the Government—

Mr. THOMAS. That is the reason why I am making the inquiry. What is the need of the Department of Agriculture preparing as well as distributing and using?

Mr. GRONNA. They have to be prepared especially for this purpose. As I understand it, they will be used for blowing out stumps in what we call the cut-over land in those States, and possibly for blasting rock.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not objecting to the appropriation, but the word "preparation" seems to me to be broad enough to include the manufacture of these explosives, which, of course, is beyond the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department, or it ought to be. The distribution and use of picric acid is all right. The preparation of the acid is the equivalent of its manufacture, or it can be so construed, and it will be so construed if you give the department half a chance.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GRONNA. I will read from the department's report, if the Senator will permit me:

The War Department has a surplus of approximately 12,500,000 pounds of picric acid, which is available for distribution by the Department of Agriculture. This explosive is suitable for land-clearing operations, in that it is both effective and safe to handle.

Mr. THOMAS. I am entirely in favor of the amendment so far as the purpose goes. I shall not make any objection, but I think the word "preparation" ought to be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move to strike out that word?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I move to strike out the word "preparation," in line 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee. It will be agreed to in the absence of objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I must object to that. I desire to be heard on it before it is passed upon, and wish to express briefly my objections.

That, I think, is a very important item. I happen to know something about it. I know that the Bureau of Roads has been conducting very important investigations along the line of those provided for in the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator understands that I propose to strike out only one word?

Mr. MYERS. I understand, the word "preparation"; but I assume that the bureau has gotten up the amendment and worded it as it thinks will fit its needs, and as the Bureau of Public Roads has had considerable experience along this line and knows what its needs are for the future it seems to me it would be unwise to interfere with the wording of the amendment. I do not know just how they desire to prepare the explosives, but if they think there is some preparation necessary for the investigations it seems to me it would be wise not to limit them. I do not want the amendment to be adopted unanimously without objection. I wish to vote against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to strike out the word "preparation."

Mr. MYERS. I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 72, line 19, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Public Roads from "\$329,500" to "\$365,060."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 20, to increase the total appropriation for Bureau of Public Roads from "\$443,960" to "\$479,520."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 10, before the words "custodian of supplies," to strike out "one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 11, to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to read:

That not less than \$40,000 shall be used for a study of the methods of prevention of losses by deterioration, decay, and freezing of fruits and vegetables in storage and in transit in refrigerator cars, heater cars, and ocean vessels, including demonstrations of such methods, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 6, after the word "received," to strike out "in interstate commerce"; after line 8 to insert "or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom"; and in line 13, after the word "certificates," to insert "covering interstate shipments," so as to read:

For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, poultry, butter, hay, and other perishable farm products, when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate, or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, including payment of such fees as will be reasonable and as nearly as may be to cover the cost for the service rendered: *Provided*, That certificates covering interstate shipments issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, \$175,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the chairman of the committee believe that that amendment ought to be agreed to, striking out the words "in interstate commerce"? In other words, would it not have to be in interstate commerce before we would have any power over it?

Mr. GRONNA. There are times when shipments are made only within the States.

Mr. SMOOT. Within the State it would be intrastate commerce.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator think we have any right to do that?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me suggest to the Senator from Utah that it is not an exercise of power or of right. It is simply an investigation on the part of agents of the department. We are not attempting to interfere with the commerce, except to give a certificate as to the condition in which the product may be. We are not confining the activities of the agents of the Department of Agriculture to interstate or intrastate work, so far as that is concerned. I do not think there is any question of power involved.

Mr. SMOOT. The only question in my mind was whether there was a power involved or employed.

Mr. GRONNA. I can read what the department has to say about it.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that it is not proper. All I say is that if there is a power or even an implied power involved, then it would be wrong to strike out the words.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I suggest to the Senator that in the amendment in line 13, on the same page, relating to certificates which are authorized to be issued, the committee have amended it so that it only covers interstate shipments?

Mr. SMOOT. I think that amendment clears up the one under consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a full explanation if the Senator wants to have it read.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the succeeding amendment will clear it up, although I should like to have the Senator read the explanation and see what it is.

Mr. GRONNA. I read from the report of the committee as follows:

The language of this paragraph has been amended by striking out the words "in interstate commerce," in lines 6 and 7, and inserting the words "or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom," in line 9, and the words "covering interstate shipments," after the word "certificates," in line 13.

The words "in interstate commerce" are recommended to be omitted and "covering interstate shipments" added for the following reasons:

(1) The food products inspection service is permissive and in no way regulatory or mandatory. On this account it in no way interferes with the rights of the citizens of any State. Inspections are made only upon application by interested parties, who gladly pay for the service in order to secure a disinterested statement of the true quality and condition of the product in dispute. No one is compelled to request inspections. Those who have no need for such a service or who do not seek it are not required to accept it.

(2) The fundamental purposes of the inspection service are to facilitate the distribution and marketing of farm produce and to the settlement of disputes as to the quality and condition of the produce and hastening the release of cars used in transporting it. When the service is restricted to interstate shipments, these purposes can be accomplished only in a partial way.

(3) When the service is once established in a market, practically no additional expense is necessary to make inspections of intrastate shipments. The present restriction decreases the fees received and proportionately increases the cost per car inspected.

(4) This service was intended for the protection of all producers who ship their products to distant markets and desire to have the benefit of a reliable disinterested report on their condition upon arrival at market. By restricting inspections to interstate shipments many producers are denied a highly useful service for which they are willing to pay. The reason for such discrimination is not obvious when no such limitation is applied to most of the other activities of the department, through which valuable services are rendered to producers and others.

The insertion of the words "or at points which may be conveniently reached therefrom" is desired in the interest of efficiency and convenience. Many inspections can be made at small towns at short distances from large central markets. A service of this character would be a great accommodation to shippers, although in most cases it might not be desirable formally to designate such points as important central markets at which inspections could be made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will permit me, after reading the full paragraph of the bill and noticing the amendment in line

13 of the same paragraph, and taking the two together, it seems to me it is all right.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is the very point to which I wished to call the attention of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. No matter what question arises, that takes care of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, turning back for a moment to the amendment on page 74, line 11, there is a proviso that not less than \$40,000 of the previous appropriation shall be used for the study of the methods and prevention of loss by deterioration, decay, or freezing in fruits, vegetables, and so forth, in storage and in transit. On page 24 there is an appropriation for the investigation and improvement of fruits, the study of the behavior of fruits during the processes of transportation, marketing, and while in commercial storage, \$83,200. That would seem on the face of it to be a duplication of appropriations for practically the same purpose. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to that fact. If it is intentional that they should be duplicated, of course, that is a different matter.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] to explain it, as the increase was made at his request.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Colorado is not questioning the increase. He is calling attention to what he thinks is a duplication. I did not clearly catch his statement, however.

Mr. THOMAS. The proviso beginning on line 11, page 74, seems to cover, although in different phraseology, the same purpose for which the appropriation is made on page 24, beginning with line 4, extending down to line 16.

Mr. GRONNA. The item on page 24 is for the investigation and improvement of fruit, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. Is that the item to which the Senator refers?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and then it is followed by the words "studies of the behavior of fruit during the processes of transportation, marketing, and while in commercial storage." The language is different, but the purpose seems to be the same.

Mr. GRONNA. It is for this particular purpose, as I understand it. On the Pacific coast a carload of fruit is loaded, we will say at Seattle. As I understand it, a great deal of that fruit is lost either through chilling or freezing. The appropriation is to be used purposely to study and find out what kind of cars, what kind of lining of cars, and what kind of equipment should be used in shipping the fruit from the West over the Rocky Mountains to the East.

Mr. THOMAS. The purpose may be a good one, and I am not quarreling with that, but I do not think we should make a duplicate appropriation for the same purpose and cover it under a different phraseology.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the provision on page 24, I think, was changed when the word "transportation" came out?

Mr. THOMAS. It was changed by the transposition of the word "transportation" to another place in the sentence.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not remember just what the language was as changed.

Mr. THOMAS. I can give it to the Senator from memory. The word "transportation" was stricken out where it now appears and then inserted after the word "storage" so as to read, "while in commercial storage and transportation."

Mr. WARREN. No; the words inserted were "also the effect of transportation," after the words "commercial storage."

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I think it applies to a different proposition. It is for a specific purpose. The language on page 74 is more of an enumeration, specifying the particular things that they have in mind to guard against. It may be that the general language might be construed of course to cover it, but there is a great deal of that in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. The word "behavior" on page 24 as applied to fruits and vegetables of course is susceptible of wide application.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; that is true.

Mr. THOMAS. But it is certainly wide enough to include any of the specific purposes for which the \$40,000 appropriation is made.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is either wide or narrow, if anyone wishes to place a narrow construction on it.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; but the department never puts a very narrow construction upon an appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to point out something in the structure of this bill which, I

think, is exceedingly faulty. The Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is not supposed to be a scientific bureau; it is not supposed to carry on scientific investigations. It was established by Congress to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing, and so forth, of farm products, and to collect, publish, and distribute by telegraph, mail, and otherwise timely information on the market supply and demand. It is a statistical bureau. Now we find, however, that on page 74 the bureau is directed to go outside of its sphere as originally intended and to make studies of chemical reactions of fruits and vegetables while in transportation. That duty belongs to the Bureau of Plant Industry, and this appropriation should not be here—it should be under the Plant Industry Bureau—for it is the Plant Industry Bureau that employs the chemists and the laboratory experts and the so-called scientists, all of whom are called "doctor"; but the men under the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates are statisticians; they are reporters of market conditions. They are not supposed to go into laboratories and inspect a rotten apple to find out how it became rotten in transit. That is a chemical undertaking, and should be under the Plant Industry Bureau. We are building up here another bureau of scientific investigation under the heading "Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates," although we already have a bureau of scientific investigation in the department as it is.

I think it very unfortunate that the other House appropriated \$326,000 under this heading. It should go under the other heading. Certainly to increase the appropriation \$40,000 and simply employ a new group of scientists to investigate the very matter that, according to the Senator from Colorado, is being investigated by another branch of the service is a foolish waste of money. I have no objection whatsoever to the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. GRONNA. I hardly think the Senator from New York will criticize the whole paragraph because the paragraph is very plain. It reads:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing and distributing of farm and nonmanufactured food products—

Of course, it would be proper to criticize the proviso.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The proviso is what I am criticizing.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator, I think, referred to the whole paragraph. Of course, the Senator knows that this is a very important provision?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. GRONNA. It has to do with the furnishing of crop and market reports, especially as to vegetables. While we are discussing this question, for the good of the order—for that seems to be what it is—I was about, if the Senator from New York is through, to read a letter which I received this morning from one of my constituents. It is a criticism of the work done by the Bureau of Markets, and calls attention to the fact that only certain stations are designated for the purpose of inspection. My correspondent calls attention to certain towns in Illinois. I desire to have the letter read, because it bears directly upon the subject, and I ask that the Secretary read the letter, because he reads so much better than I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., February 18, 1921.

Senator GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In our business of shipping potatoes, of which we ship between 500 to 1,000 cars each season, we run across many people who take advantage of the market and refuse potatoes on arrival if the market is less than when they purchased them. Then, again, there are others who refuse potatoes because they think they can buy them at a reduction.

Under the Bureau of Markets there has been established what is known as the inspection bureau, which keeps inspectors at the larger trade centers, and which will send inspectors out from these trade centers to inspect potatoes at various points they name. They put out a list of what they call "designated points," to which inspectors will be sent from their regular established office in trade centers.

We do a very large business in the State of Illinois. We run across considerable trouble there. Last fall we had a car refused at Lincoln, Ill., a station about 25 miles north of Springfield, directly intermediate between Springfield and Chicago. The inspection bureau would send a man to Springfield but not to Lincoln, although to reach Springfield he had to go through Lincoln. To go to Chicago he had to go through Lincoln from Springfield.

To-day we have three cars that we have had refused at Decatur, Decatur, by the way, is one of the largest potato markets in the United States. We wired an inspector to go to Decatur from Chicago to inspect these cars. We are advised, as we were last fall, that Decatur is not a designated point, therefore they can not send an inspector; but they would send the same inspector through Decatur to Springfield, a distance of 45 miles farther. To-day we are doing as we did last fall—diverting the cars from Decatur to Springfield, at an expense of about \$40 per car.

The object of this letter is to call your attention to the ridiculous ruling of the Bureau of Markets. There is no reason why they should send a man to one point in Illinois and not to another. It is ridiculous that we should have to send a car from Decatur to Springfield to have it inspected. It can not possibly make a difference in the service as long as they have to send an inspector from Chicago.

I feel justified in calling your attention to this and request that you use your best efforts to apply intermediate points between the inspector's office and the designated markets as places where inspections may be made, and that inspections be applied much as freight rates are. For instance, the rate to Chicago on a car of potatoes by the Chicago & Northwestern is 48 cents per hundred. This is a terminal rate, but the same rate applies not only to Chicago but to all intermediate points between Chicago and St. Paul. The same action should be taken as regards inspections, and the rule should be made, and made promptly, to serve shippers justly and equitably, that inspectors may be sent from Chicago to Springfield or any intermediate points, where the time for the inspector to be away from his office would not exceed the time necessary to go from Chicago to Springfield.

Now that the potato movement is in full swing, we would urge that you take this up immediately and see if we can not have some remedy.

Yours, respectfully,

O. J. BARNES CO.
By O. J. BARNES, President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, again for the purposes of the Record—I do not mean to detain the Senate unduly—let me call the attention of the Senate to a provision on page 75. Let us remember that we are appropriating money for the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, but we find there this proviso:

That of the sum thus appropriated \$30,000 may be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton.

Surely that belongs under the Bureau of Plant Industry; it has no business here. We are building up another bureau of plant industry under the heading of "Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator surely is mistaken as to that, for the reason that the item is for the purpose of determining the relative value in the market of the different grades of cotton. It should not come under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry." The same cotton plant produces different grades of cotton, arising from the fact that the cotton is gathered at different times and that which remains in the field any length of time has a different color from that which is promptly harvested. It is desired to make tests, so as to ascertain whether or not the tensile strength of the cotton, which may be somewhat discolored, its bleaching qualities, and its market value are not equal to those of the cotton of the better quality. So this item pertains exactly to the Bureau of Markets, and has nothing to do, as the Senator seems to intimate, with developing a plant that will produce different grades. It has to do with the market value of the article, as expressed in the different grades, some of us believing that there was no appreciable difference on account of the accident of color or of foreign matter in the cotton, as to its tensile strength, its bleaching qualities, and its cloth-making qualities.

I should like to say to the Senator that we had a preliminary investigation of some of the grades in connection with which the dealers had made quite a difference, but as tested out by the Government it was demonstrated that in tensile strength, in bleaching qualities, and in yarn-making and cloth-making qualities the alleged inferior cotton was equal to what were claimed to be higher grades, for which there was a better price obtained.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator from South Carolina is right, then there are some items under the head of the Bureau of Plant Industry that ought not to be there.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not know as to that; I have not investigated that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am trying to get similar items under one head—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I understand; but I merely wanted to correct the Senator as to the cotton items.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And to protest against the duplication of work and the needless spreading around of the different pieces of work.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to page 24. There we direct the Bureau of Plant Industry to study the behavior of fruits in process of transportation. Of course, if they are in process of transportation they are on the way to market. Therefore, according to the Senator's contention, that work should be done by the Bureau of Markets, because it affects the market value of the fruit.

Again, on lines 20 and 21 of the same page, we provide that the Bureau of Plant Industry shall study the behavior of vegetables in the process of transportation and marketing. Either those two items should be placed under the heading "Bureau of Markets" or the two items which I have pointed out, on pages 74 and 75, should be put under the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As to the item on page 24:

For the investigation and improvement of fruits, and the method of fruit growing, harvesting, and, in cooperation with the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates, studies of the behavior of fruits during the process of transportation, marketing, and while in commercial storage—

The first part of that paragraph, the Senator from New York must admit, rightfully comes under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry." If I understood the Senator from Oregon correctly, he stated that certain diseases were sometimes made manifest in the processes of shipment, and it was to study, as I understood him to say, the appearance of that fungus, the brown and black rot that occurred in this fruit. I want to give my understanding of this, for the Senator from New York is a member of the committee, and I am also a member of it. The point made by the Senator from Oregon was that there is no dispute about the first part of the paragraph to which the Senator from New York refers, on page 24, belonging to the work of that bureau.

Mr. WADSWORTH. None at all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator from Oregon called the committee's attention to the fact that certain fungous diseases made themselves apparent during the time of shipment, and that he desired to have the Bureau of Plant Industry clothed with the power of investigating the reasons for it and all that was necessary to find out just what might be done to prevent the appearance of that disease in transportation.

The language may be somewhat unfortunate, but I understand that to be the object, and it seemed to me that this was a very pertinent place for it to appear. As to its being a duplication of the other work, I do not see any analogy whatever. Just what lines did the Senator say were a duplication on pages 24 and 75?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The direct duplication is between page 24 and page 74; but there is another item on the bottom of page 75, which, while not duplicated elsewhere, seems to me to provide for work which ought to be done by a scientific bureau. We have a number of scientific bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, but now we find that the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is gradually absorbing scientific investigational functions.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, there is no scientific work whatever connected with the testing of bleaching qualities. That is a mechanical process. There is no scientific work at all on an electric device for testing the tensile strength of the fiber. It is just like weighing a pound of meat or a pound of butter. You have your instrument; you put upon it yarns of so many counts, and have the weights put upon it, and it automatically registers the breaking point; so that all you have to do is to get the scientists to make the standard, and then the test is made, and there is no science in it. It is simply testing the intrinsic commercial value of the material and the work of giving us that information belongs entirely to the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is perfectly correct as to the item on the bottom of page 75, but not correct as to the item on page 74. That I think, is an out-and-out duplication of work.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Utah point out to me where he thinks there is a duplication? I should like to say that I think duplications in our departments ought to be corrected wherever possible, and for that reason I am asking him to point out in what particulars he thinks these two items are duplications.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will read the proviso beginning on line 11, page 74, down to and including line 15, and then read the provision on page 24, beginning with line 4 and including line 8, as amended, I think he will see that there is no question but that there is a duplication there; and, furthermore, I think the objections of the Senator from New York apply to these provisions. There will be built up in the Bureau of Markets a scientific personnel in these two cases. It will be exactly that. It can not help but be that if the work is to be done. If the Bureau of Markets do not give any more correct information upon these items than the Senator from South Carolina thinks they have given on the cotton crop, I do not think we ought to rely upon them at all, and I think if we did we would be running into an alley with nothing but a blank wall at the end of the alley.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate, but I want to say for the Record that in reading this paragraph on page 74 I can not understand how anyone can question the fact that that work belongs to the Bureau of Markets, for it says that no less than \$40,000 shall be used for the study of methods of prevention of losses.

Mr. SMOOT. By what?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. By deterioration and decay. It does not enter into any scientific field. Suppose you are shipping a carload of watermelons and you find that by piling them up on each other, not crating them, they break down and are ruined. You have not scientifically investigated anything. You have investigated the mechanical process by which this loss was incurred. Therefore, if you can find some carriage that will prevent it, you have prevented the loss.

Mr. SMOOT. Suppose it were a case of grapefruit or a case of apples, and they were not piled up on each other and the dimensions of that case were regulated by law. Suppose the law said that it must be just so long and so wide and so high. The only way to find the cause of deterioration or decay would be to make a chemical analysis, and they would have to have a specialist for that purpose; and that is what this provides for.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Oh, no.

Mr. SMOOT. But it says here—

Methods of prevention of losses by deterioration, decay, and freezing of fruits and vegetables in storage and in transit in refrigerator cars, heater cars, and ocean vessels.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think that is entirely pertinent to the work of the Bureau of Markets, in so far as they can find what has been the cause by virtue of improper crating, by virtue of improper refrigerating, and all of the incidents that would help the producer or the shipper to know what were the causes. I think that comes clearly within the purview of the work of this bureau, and I think there is no duplication of work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 75, line 22, before the word "may," to strike out "\$25,860" and insert "\$30,000," so as to read:

For investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for the different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton, and for investigating the ginning, grading, stapling, baling, marking, compressing, and tare of cotton, \$38,400: *Provided*, That of the sum thus appropriated \$30,000 may be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton in order to determine their spinning value and for demonstrating the results of such tests.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 15, after the word "agencies," to strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$350,000," so as to read:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-stock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stocks, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of live stock and live-stock products on farms, in cooperation with the States Relations Service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, \$350,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, after line 15, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That not less than \$100,000 shall be used for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think the proposed amendment is one of the most desirable, one of the most needed, and one which will prove perhaps the most beneficial of any proposition which this measure contains.

Heretofore the information which has been gathered and disseminated by the Agricultural Department has informed consumer of the probable extent and amount of the crops, but it has not given any reciprocal information to the producer, who gropes in the dark, so to speak, as regards markets, the demand for products here, there, and yonder, and the probable effect upon his produce of corresponding production in other parts of the world.

This is something for which the public money can be well expended. Inasmuch as I have been prone to object to a great many of the appropriations in this and preceding Agricultural bills—objections which I think are well founded—it is a source of pleasure for me to be able to give my unqualified approbation to an object such as is here sought to be subserved. I am satisfied that it will be productive of immense benefit, and I certainly would not complain if the amount appropriated for the purpose were much in excess of what is stated.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I fully agree with the Senator from Colorado as to the wisdom of securing this information,

but here, again, we are duplicating the work that is done by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, for which we appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars; and in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee on the sundry civil appropriation bill we found that they were doing the exact work and collecting the information that we anticipated the Tariff Commission were collecting, and it was shown that the Tariff Commission came to that bureau and secured the information upon which they based some of their figures and reports. The very information asked for by this amendment is already collected and can be secured from that bureau, and it is a mere duplication of work.

I know that the work ought to be done; I know that this information ought to be in the possession of the Government; but if the testimony that has been given to the Committee on Appropriations is to be relied upon that information is being collected from all parts of the world to-day by our commercial attachés. If it is not being collected, what are they doing, and why are we spending the hundreds of thousands of dollars in salaries paid to them and expenses for the purpose of collecting all information that affects our foreign trade?

I do not know whether the chairman of the committee has had his attention called to that matter or not.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, Mr. President; I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I remember very well when that matter was taken up; but the Senator, I believe, will agree with me that the amount appropriated in the other appropriation bill is for manufactured products.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe I am safe in saying that 90 per cent of that money is not used for agricultural products.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say what it is used for, but it is not for that purpose; it is for all purposes.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not say it is for that purpose, but I do say that not to exceed 10 per cent of it is used for any such purposes as we are providing for here.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not deny that they claimed that this information that they were collecting affected all of the foreign trade of the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator. I am not in disagreement as to what is claimed for it; but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has explained this paragraph much better than I can, and I am very glad to have his approval of it. The committee thought that they really had done good service in being able to work out this proposition.

The Senator from Utah knows that there was a large estimate for this particular work; that is, for the Bureau of Markets the estimate was \$590,741. The House allowed \$250,000 only. The Senate committee increased that \$100,000 and inserted this particular provision, and I am very glad to have the absolute approval of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and also to have the partial approval of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I said in my opening statement that this information ought to be collected, but if the testimony before the Appropriations Committee was correct we have this information. The Senator from North Dakota was present, I think, when it was testified before the committee that the information which we thought the Tariff Commission was collecting as to this foreign business was really being collected by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure the Senator will admit, because he is always fair and reasonable, that, if we do have it, the language in this provision is so broad that there will be no necessity for the expenditure of any money for obtaining that part of it. There will be no duplication.

Mr. SMOOT. There certainly will be duplication and extra expense, if we send men to foreign countries and at the expense which it takes to send them there, and pay them, together with what has to be paid for their keep when away from Washington, to collect this information. If they are going to collect any they ought to be there to collect it all, and that is what we have the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for. I have not any doubt but what this money will be spent, even if it is necessary to send them on a junketing trip, before the end of the fiscal year 1922.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does it not involve to some extent rather strengthening our representation on the International Institute of Agriculture? There is an agency for gathering information as to the world supply of various products, the prices, conditions, and that sort of thing.

Mr. SMOOT. We make another appropriation for that. That is an institute which has headquarters in Rome, and Mr. Lubin was there for years, but he is now dead, so we have to send somebody else there.

Mr. FLETCHER. Now we are simply paying the salary of one man in that position.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am very much interested in the Department of Commerce, which has commercial attachés to furnish information to the people of this country. I do not agree with the Senator from Utah that they gather the information provided for under this provision. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota, who is a member of the committee, who recalls that tradesmen of the United States, members of the chambers of commerce, urged appropriations in order that they might get this information, so that they would know what could be furnished, how it would be furnished, and all about it, but nothing as to farm products.

Mr. SMOOT. All foreign commerce, farm and everything else. If we go on this way we might just as well give notice to all of the departments of the Government, "If the Appropriations Committee will not give you what you want, come to the Committee on Agriculture, and you can get it." I do not think that would be proper; I do not think it would be right.

Mr. President, in what I have said to-day I have an object in view. I think that when the next Secretary of Agriculture is inducted into office he ought to go through the appropriation bill before making estimates for the next year—that is, I mean for the fiscal year following the one for which this bill provides—and ought to take everything out of it that leads to a duplication of work done in other departments. I am going to ask the new Secretary of Agriculture that that be done, and then let all of the departments understand that they can only secure an appropriation from one committee, and let it be understood that it must be in one appropriation and for one specific purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator will carry out that theory with respect to Army appropriations, because the Appropriations Committee to-day is spending money for the Army, and so is the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely; and the Senator knows that. Many a time, if we did not have a member of the Military Affairs Committee as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, there would be brought into this Chamber duplication after duplication, as the Senator from New York knows. We have tried to work together, and tried to eliminate those duplications, as far as the Military Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee are concerned.

Mr. GORE. I want to suggest to the Senator from Utah that he offer an amendment to this bill requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress a report at the next regular session embodying that information.

Mr. SMOOT. I think more than likely when the time arrives for the making of the next appropriation bill the commission on reorganization may have made some kind of a report, and I express the hope that the Senate will support the recommendations of that commission wherever they eliminate duplication of work in any of the departments of the Government. That is all that commission will undertake to do, and before a recommendation is ever made to Congress the members of that commission have to make a study of it. They have to go into the details of it. They have to themselves know whether it is a duplication of work, and if I had my way that commission would work in full accord with the head of every department of our Government. But whenever it is found to be a fact that there is duplication of work in any form whatever, then that ought to be eliminated from the Government appropriations.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that we had better undertake to eliminate this service and lop off these powers pretty early in the next administration before the pride of power on the part of the heads of departments attaches.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a very wise suggestion on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma, because past experience has demonstrated that after they get in and really find out how many employees they have they will keep every single one of them. They are just as tenacious about keeping their employees and their authority as an individual would be if he owned an interest in a great corporation and desired it to be not only as large as it was but to increase every year.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] taking this matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture and providing against a duplication of work in any bill that may be presented to the next Congress. I am in favor of that. I do hope that the amendment to this bill offered by the committee, which has been supported so ably by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], will be adopted, because this work ought to be done. The present provision in the law which has been referred to does not extend to this character of work, and I trust this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I think the statement of the Senator from Utah as to what he intends to do shows a mighty good purpose. I want to suggest that in doing that the Secretary of Agriculture should go outside of his department and get about three men who are not interested in the work of the department, as departmental work, and have them suggest a reframing of this bill, because he will never do away with these duplications if he leaves it largely to the chiefs of the bureaus, as he will have to do unless he goes outside of the department.

But this is what I rose to call attention to. The Committee on Agriculture has condemned this provision on page 76, the first part of the paragraph, for collecting and filing and getting estimates, and so forth. The Committee on Agriculture itself has condemned that provision and the Senate has indorsed that condemnation. We passed a resolution the other day directing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate and ascertain the amount of wheat and cotton and things like that on hand throughout the country, and the reason for it was that the estimates and reports and the work of the department are not reliable—are not worth anything, and if it had been discussed by those in favor of the resolution before the Senate as they discussed it with me, they would have denounced in unmeasured terms the work of the department. They said it was not reliable, could not be depended upon, was not worth anything, and therefore it was necessary for the Agricultural Committee to investigate it. Yet here we are appropriating \$350,000 for doing that work. We will probably have another resolution of investigation at the end of the year to find out the amount of these things on hand.

I do not share to a certain extent the opinion of the work of the department in this respect the Committee on Agriculture apparently had and that the Senate apparently had, but I do doubt its correctness and reliability.

Mr. McNARY. I want to say to the Senator from Washington that his inference is too broad. I do not know any member of the Committee on Agriculture who has criticized these departments or duplicated the reports they have sent in. If any members of the committee have done so, it has been as individuals. This item has been carried for a number of years, and been extended by reason of the provision found in line 15. The question someone raised here the other day, speaking as a Senator, was that he wanted the Agricultural Committee to investigate the sources upon which these estimates were made. But no member of the Agricultural Committee, or the committee itself, has ever duplicated the work of this department or any of the departments connected with and doing this great service to American farmers.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I may have made the statement a little too broad. I believe that resolution was not referred to the Committee on Agriculture. But, Mr. President, I find members of the Committee on Agriculture are supporting that resolution on the floor of the Senate. There was not one of them who questioned the desirability of having this investigation made, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] stated to me that this work of the department, and these reports they were getting out, and the information they had, were not reliable at all. I agree with him. I do not think they were, and I do not think we will get any more reliable information by the investigation of the committee, as far as that is concerned.

I am not opposing this proposition. I just wanted to call attention to the resolution of investigation, and I presume we will have another one at the end of the coming fiscal year, condemning the information furnished by the department under this appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is another occasion when a Member of the Senate is not well informed on the matter to which he speaks. Those of us who have been affected, and have investigated, find that the statistics affecting one particular thing are gotten up by every department, and come in different phases, and the Senator was speaking about my offering a resolution and inveighing against the Bureau of Markets. That was only a part of the source of information. The Bureau of the Census was the particular one I had reference to. The Census Bureau is charged with gathering the statistics as to the supply and distribution of wheat and other grain, and of cotton.

I asked for their sources of information as to the world's supply and the American supply. They gave me their estimates and the sources of their information. The Bureau of Markets comes along and makes an estimate of the supply, but not of the distribution, and the two are more or less conflicting. Both of them, I believe, were incorrect. The sources of information might have been satisfactory to them but were not to me. I do not believe they were satisfactory to the members of the Agricultural Committee, although I do not know.

I have nothing to say about this particular department, because they were not charged under the law with gathering the figures as to the supply and distribution of any particular crop in a statistical way, but the Bureau of the Census was, and it was their method and the result of that method that I called into question, and incidentally the Bureau of Markets only in so far as they pertained to it.

I thought the other day when the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] was discussing the matter that he had an idea that the Bureau of Markets were the ones who gathered the information and disseminated it, when as a matter of fact it is the Bureau of the Census. I said the other day, and repeat now, that we ought not to have duplications along such lines of work but should have one department to do a specific work and hold them responsible for that specific work.

In conclusion I wish to say, as to the criticism of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] about duplication of work, that whatever pertains to the agricultural interests of the country ought to be carried in an agricultural bill, and if some of the departments duplicate the work that rightfully belongs to the Department of Agriculture, that other department ought to be cut out and there should not be a restriction of the work of the Department of Agriculture. The thing he criticizes is about us demanding that, if we are to give to the world the products of this country, then we should know what are the market conditions that the producers of the country have to meet. It is restricted to agricultural products, the production and the effect of the supply in the world of those things that we have to meet in competition, and therefore rightfully belongs in this bill. If there is any criticism as to duplication, let it go out of the other department that is duplicating the work of the Agricultural Department and leave the Department of Agriculture equipped to serve the farmer.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What the Senator says confirms me in the belief that I did know what I was talking about. The Bureau of Markets is called the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. That does not confine it to potatoes or corn or barley or rye or oats. That includes wheat and includes cotton. They have been getting out their reports. I have seen what is called the Crop Reporter coming out from time to time. It purports to give estimates, and so forth, and I have not any doubt that it is all compiled under the language of the bill. The language of the bill is just as broad as it could be made for the collecting of such information.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Washington will allow me, they give out estimates, but that is not the question that I was complaining of most, nor was it the basis, particularly, of the resolution that I offered. The Bureau of the Census is one that gives out an official report of the supply and distribution of the standard crops in this country. I have in my desk their annual report. The Bureau of Markets is practically in its beginning. The Census Bureau has been established for years and years.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The other reports are just as official as the reports gotten out by the Bureau of the Census. They are both provided for by law. The language has been carried in the bill for some time.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. They do not pertain to the same subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They may cover the subject. Here is the way it reads:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and live-stock estimates—

If that does not cover wheat and cotton and all that sort of thing and estimates for them provided by law and make the reports just as official as any reports of the Bureau of the Census, I can not understand language or the effect of legislative provisions. It continues:

acreage, yield, grades, stocks, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of live stock and live-stock products on farms.

I do not complain if the Senator has no confidence in the reports. What I complain of is that we will appropriate two or three hundred thousand dollars for getting the reports, and then probably spend one or two hundred thousand dollars for the Committee on Agriculture to go around over the country and show that the reports are no good.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I did not have a word to say about the particular item that the Senator has read. They estimate how much, and that is all right, but the Bureau of the Census is charged not only with estimating how much we make but how much we consume, how much the world consumes of that article, what stock is left over after one consumption year to be carried into the next consumption year,

and then as to the world's supply of a like product and how much of that is carried over, including American production. This only pertains to our domestic crop as to production, estimate of production, and so forth.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If that is correct, then we ought to do away with the item entirely and let the Bureau of the Census furnish the information, or else we ought to take away the right of the Census Bureau to do that and let the other organization do it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Just how far they duplicate is a matter that the Senate ought to correct. I agree thoroughly with that. I think the Department of Agriculture ought to get the ginners' report for cotton, the thrashers' report for wheat, and then give out the bulletins stating how much has been produced, how much consumed, how much exported, and how much of the world production of like things have been imported into this country, consumed abroad and here, and what is the probable supply, in order to enable farmers of the country to govern themselves in the production of the crop. I do claim that that duplication ought to be cut out. The Census Department ought to quit this work or the Department of Agriculture ought to quit it. I agree thoroughly with the Senator in that respect, but I claim that the Census Bureau has not given us a satisfactory account.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the reason why it ought to be cut out.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am not quarreling with that. I am stating that there has been, in my opinion, a disastrous result, either from this duplication or a lack of money or something else, in getting the proper figures and putting them in proper shape.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, lack of information about the various provisions in the Agricultural appropriation bill, I think, is responsible for the attacks that are being made upon them by various Senators. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] does not seem to understand that the matter of gathering certain statistics of farm products is different from the reports of the amount of cotton ginned. The Bureau of Markets looks out for places in the country where certain products are demanded and for places in the country where certain farm products are grown. The Bureau of Crop Estimates estimates the number of acres planted in certain crops, grain or cotton, and it estimates the size of the crop according to the information that it obtains. The Census Bureau reports the amount of cotton coming into the market that has been produced by the cotton farmer, hauled to the gin, separated from the seed, and the lint packed into a bale. The ginner's report accounts for this cotton. That is what we had in mind the other day when we supported the resolution to gather the information about the amount of cotton on hand in the United States, all kinds of cotton, unspinnable cotton, linters, and spinnable cotton.

The Senator from Washington has this matter all confused in his mind when he reads the provision about the Bureau of Crop Estimates and the Bureau of Markets. They are two separate departments. One gives information as to the marketing of the products and the other estimates the amount of acres planted and the size of the crop to be produced, and I repeat all this is separate and distinct from the gathering of reports as to cotton ginned. I hope that some time during the discussion on the bill we will get the matter clear in the mind of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a fact that he apparently does not know, and that is that the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates is one bureau, and that the one bureau not only looks after markets but the making of crop estimates.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator is mistaken about that. The Bureau of Markets may be connected with the Bureau of Crop Estimates, but there is a bureau that looks after the estimating of crops separate and distinct from the Bureau of Markets itself.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee why the appropriation is made for the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates as one bureau? Why does he not designate it as two bureaus if there are two bureaus?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Washington that the chairman of the committee did not draw the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask the chairman of the committee if there are two bureaus.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Esterbrook, if I may name the man—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not care anything about the names of the men. I want to know where the appropriation is in the bill for the Chief of the Bureau of Crop Estimates.

Mr. McNARY. Page 72, line 22.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is for the Chief of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. I want to know where the appropriation is for two bureaus under this head of Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates. That is what I want to know, and why it is not called bureaus if there are two bureaus.

Mr. GRONNA. There is a division. One is a division and the other is a bureau.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, well, that is a different proposition. There is only one bureau.

Mr. GRONNA. There is a division, if the Senator will permit me to answer. If not, of course he can go on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should like to have the Senator answer me. I want to know.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will give me time, I will answer him.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am asking the Senator if there is one bureau or if there are two bureaus?

Mr. GRONNA. There is one bureau known as the Bureau of Statistics. There are two divisions, the Division of Crop Estimates and the Division of Markets.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope the Senator from Alabama will listen to this explanation. The chairman of the committee says there is only one bureau.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I said.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But there is a division which does the work of crop estimates.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, there may be two divisions or four divisions or five divisions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Their work is entirely different.

Mr. HEFLIN. It is a matter of construction.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator said there were two bureaus.

Mr. HEFLIN. I may be mistaken about the two bureaus, but there is another division in there that has to do with crop estimates, separate and distinct from the Bureau of Markets.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not dispute that, but it is all under one bureau and under one head.

Mr. HEFLIN. I believe that the Senator is about to get this matter straight in his mind.

Mr. HARRISON. Of course, it is all agreed that there is one bureau and two divisions.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Good.

Mr. HARRISON. So the Senator from Washington is right and the Senator from Alabama is right.

I want to read the provision which the Committee on Agriculture has unanimously reported and which, it seems, every Senator on the floor is in favor of, merely to call the attention of the Senate to it before we finally vote upon it:

Provided, That not less than \$100,000 shall be used for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government.

We are trying here to help the American producer to obtain data and information to enable him to sell his goods, wares, and products in foreign countries; in other words, to help promote, in our export trade, the sale of our agricultural products. I am a little amused that some Senators should favor this provision under the peculiar circumstances which have developed at this session of Congress. I can understand how we may save \$100,000 in the event certain contingencies arise. If the so-called emergency tariff bill should become a law and a sufficient number should be corralled in the Senate and in the other House to override the President's veto, for which Senators on the other side of the aisle are praying, we would not need make this appropriation, because if that bill should become a law other countries would set up such methods of reprisal that we would not have any export trade and we could not ship anything to them. For instance, if that bill should become a law, placing a duty on wheat of 40 cents per bushel, and thereby making Canada mad with us and causing the Canadians, then, to place an embargo on the goods which our farmers may raise in this country for export to Canada and sale there, we would not need to go into Canada to collect any data and disseminate them among the agricultural producers of the country in the hope that they could sell anything in Canada, because if we are going to place an embargo, as we propose to do in that bill, of 40 cents a bushel on wheat imported from Canada into the United States, naturally, if we read correctly what the newspapers say, Canada will place an embargo against our shipments, not only of agricultural products but of manufactured products into Canada.

The same thing would apply touching farm products being exported to Argentina, to countries in Europe, and to other countries. Therefore, if the so-called emergency tariff bill should become a law, we could save this \$100,000; it then would not be needed at all, because the collection of data for the American producers to enable them to send their farm products to foreign markets for sale would not be necessary.

Of course, we all believe that the emergency tariff bill is a failure. I understand the conditions bear out that statement; that Senators on the other side of the Chamber have already given up all hope of it ever becoming a law. A few weeks ago Senators on the other side of the Chamber got very enthusiastic and persistent and insistent about passing the bill in a few days. First, they tried to have a day set for a vote on it.

Then, when they could not do that they tried to cram down our throats a cloture rule for the second time in the history of the United States Senate and to pass the bill right through. However, they could not get a two-thirds majority, and the effort to secure cloture failed; but eventually the bill did pass. One week from to-day the bill passed the Senate of the United States. It is now in the hands of the Senator—I think I am correct in giving the names of the conferees—from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who showed so much enthusiasm for the bill, who was so persistent in forcing it through the Senate, who believed in it so wholeheartedly and sincerely; of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and other Senators, whose names I do not at the moment recall, and who have been in conference on the bill since last Wednesday—seven days ago. The end of Congress is approaching, only a few more days remaining. Those Senators have known all the time that unless the bill got to the President within a certain date—10 days before adjournment—he might kill it by a pocket veto; that it had to get to him by a certain time in order, if he should veto it, that the Senate and House might try to pass it over his veto. But they are afraid that the Senate and the House might pass the bill over the President's veto. So the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from North Dakota—I think they are the conferees on the part of the Senate—for a week have sat in conference, holding the bill away from the Senate and the House, keeping us from taking action on it, in order that the President might either approve it or veto it.

Mr. WARREN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. HARRISON. I shall conclude in a moment.

So if the emergency tariff bill should become a law there will be no need for this \$100,000 appropriation; but if it should not become a law, then it would be a wise measure, and the appropriation should be voted.

Now I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that he is bringing news to this side of the Senate when he says we do not want the emergency tariff bill to be passed. I am inclined to doubt his authority as to that, because of his observation to the effect that we shall not need to protect our foreign markets if the bill be passed. I have heard that same cry whenever we have passed a protectionist tariff bill; it is not new at all. It has always been said, "We can not trade with other countries unless we buy of them and let them have free access to our markets," and so forth. That is not very persuasive after all these years, when we have been fortunate enough to be able to accumulate sufficient money and credit to carry on a World War involving the expenditure of these billions of dollars.

Mr. HARRISON. But the party of the Senator from Wyoming never had the audacity to impose such high tariff rates as are proposed in the emergency tariff bill. That bill, for instance, proposes a duty of 40 cents a bushel on wheat, and the Senator's party has never before thought of imposing a duty of over 20 cents a bushel on wheat. On wool—and the Senator is well versed on the question of wool—we find that in the Payne-Aldrich bill there was only a duty of 11 or 12 cents a pound on wool and not 45 cents a pound as is proposed in the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. WARREN. That is true, but in the arrangement of proportions a different tariff is called for.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is bound to admit that while one rate may be a matter of protection the other one operates as an embargo. I will not take up the time of the Senate by reading the quotations, but I have here articles from Argentina and Canada and other countries which show that they are going to retaliate by placing an embargo against the products and goods and wares shipped from this country into theirs if we pass the emergency tariff bill.

Mr. WARREN. No one who knows the Senator from Mississippi believes that he is cowardly enough to think that a tariff to last for a few months will put us in that position.

Mr. HARRISON. I sincerely hope not.

Mr. WARREN. He has too much courage for that. I am willing to admire the readiness with which he enters into these political matters whenever we talk about tariffs, and so forth, but when the time comes we shall have that all out as to our not being able to sell, and we shall have the same old threat.

Mr. HARRISON. Does not the Senator think that this matter is remaining in conference too long, it having been there a week, notwithstanding the fact that it was proposed so enthusiastically and persistently a short time ago to cram it down our throats by a cloture rule here.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator himself has served for many weeks on conference committees in connection with legislative matters. I know that I have been very many times. We are in conference now on three different bills, and we have been in conference for several days and nights. There is not any outcome yet, but I think we shall have one.

Mr. HARRISON. If the other side are not going to give us another chance to vote on the emergency tariff bill, very well. I merely thought I would call the attention of the Senate to these glaring features; that is all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 77, line 8, to increase the appropriation for general expenses of the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates from "\$1,339,560" to "\$1,439,560."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 8, to insert:

That hereafter the powers conferred and the duties imposed by law on the Bureau of Statistics and the Bureau of Crop Estimates of the Department of Agriculture shall be exercised and performed by the Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, after line 22, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That any moneys received from or in connection with the sale of cotton purchased for the preparation of practical forms of the official cotton standards and condemned as unsuitable for such use may be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for the purchase of other cotton for such use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 17, to increase the appropriation for administration of the United States warehouse act from "\$65,000" to "\$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item for completion of wool work, on page 79, after line 9, to insert:

And to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918, which said regulations are hereby legalized, ratified, and confirmed as fully to all intents and purposes as if the same had by prior act of Congress been specifically authorized and directed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for Bureau of Markets and Crop Estimates from "\$2,939,444" to "\$3,074,444."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 15, after the word "purposes" to strike out "\$115,400" and insert "\$125,000," so as to read:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 17, to increase the total appropriation for enforcement of the insecticide act from "\$146,910" to "\$156,510."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 19, to increase the appropriation for cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams from "\$125,000" to "\$625,000," so as to read:

Cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams: For cooperation with any State or group of States in the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of navigable streams under the provisions of section 2 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of nav-

igable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," \$625,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on this item. I do not think the bill contains a more deserving or more meritorious provision than this one. I shall attempt to condense what I have to say into a few words so that I shall not weary the Senators present.

The estimate of the Department of Agriculture as to the amount necessary to perform efficiently the work required was \$1,000,000. In the House the amount was decreased to \$125,000, a sum comparable to that which was used last year. When the matter came before the attention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I offered an amendment increasing the appropriation \$500,000, making the total appropriation \$625,000, which was adopted by the committee.

Mr. President, I think it is generally conceded that the prevention of forest fires is the most important test of forestry to-day. It is going to be impossible to initiate and carry into execution a reforestation policy that does not embrace the subject of forest-fire prevention. It will be observed that this item contemplates cooperation with the several States; and it is to that subject and that particular phase that I want to address myself at this time.

During the past fiscal year the Forest Service cooperated with 25 States in the protection of approximately 150,000,000 acres of State and privately owned land from forest fires. As against the Federal appropriation of \$100,000, the expenditures of the cooperating States aggregated \$800,000, making a total of nearly \$1,000,000, and the expenditures of private forest owners within these States aggregated about \$700,000. The Federal Government thus furnished but \$100,000 for the protection from fire of the State and private forests of the country out of a total expenditure for this purpose of \$1,600,000. The States themselves spent over eight times as much as the Federal Government for the protection of this splendid resource.

By the terms of the law the expenditure in any State may not exceed the State expenditures for the same purpose. In fact, Federal expenditures were uniformly very much less than State expenditures. The Federal Government's maximum expenditure during the fiscal year in any one State was \$10,432, in Maine, as against an expenditure by the State of \$116,844. It spent \$5,150 in New York as against a State expenditure of \$132,528, \$25,450 in Montana as compared with a State expenditure of \$51,549, and \$6,067 in Minnesota as compared with a State expenditure of \$104,096, and in my own State the Government spent \$6,306 as compared with a State expenditure of \$28,787.

In the case of every cooperating State appeals for additional aid were made and had to be rejected because Government funds would go no further. This fund is expended only in accordance with a specific plan for fire protection which meets with the approval of the Forest Service, and the actual use of the money is checked up in the field by inspectors from the Forest Service. The money is spent exclusively for personal services, for patrolmen, lookout watchmen, and rangers in accordance with the fire-protection plan of the State concerned.

The 25 States with which the Forest Service has cooperated contain 65,000,000 acres of forest land which are still largely unprotected. There are 14 additional States, with which there has been no cooperation hitherto, which contain important forest areas aggregating 110,000,000 acres now almost wholly unprotected. In the 39 States, all told, where the prevention of forest fires is an essential public activity, there are approximately 325,000,000 acres of timbered and cut-over lands requiring protection from fire as a first essential to a continuous supply of timber for the United States. The estimates submitted by a large number of States show that this land can not be protected on an average for less than 2½ cents per acre yearly, or an aggregate of \$8,125,000. As against this requirement the sums available from all sources, public and private, aggregated during the last fiscal year about \$1,625,000; and in this the Federal Government was represented by an appropriation of but \$125,000.

The private expenditures for the protection of forest lands are increasing from year to year; and can be largely increased if public agencies take the lead in organizing forest protection over large areas and then encouraging private owners to participate in its cost on a just basis.

The protection of forest lands from fire is an activity whose cost should be shared by the public and the private landowner. The private owner has a direct interest in the protection of his property, particularly lands containing merchantable timber. But the private owner can not equitably assume the full burden of protecting his property from the forest-fire hazard which goes far beyond the immediate boundaries of his land and to

which the whole community contributes. It is not only the duty of the public to assume a share of the protection of forest lands from fire corresponding broadly to the fire hazard which is of general or regional origin; but the public has a very large interest in maintaining the productivity of forest lands as a means of perpetuating one of our basic natural resources. This interest is shared alike by the local public, represented in the State, and by the Nation at large. Our densely populated agricultural and industrial States are dependent upon other States for their supply of timber. They have a very direct economic interest in maintaining the supply of timber being grown elsewhere on the areas logically adapted to that purpose.

It is therefore just and desirable that the National Government should share in the cost of fire protection, not relieving the owner of the land or the State from their responsibilities but sharing the enterprise with them, and by its participation encouraging them to do a great deal more than they otherwise would.

An expenditure of \$625,000 by the Government is about one-third of the cost of protecting these forest lands from destructive fires. It is considerably less than the States are now appropriating for this purpose, and will undoubtedly be much less than the State appropriations for the purpose during the next fiscal year. The benefit of this appropriation is not merely the additional funds which are available and which make it possible to extend fire protection over much larger areas, but Federal participation enables the Federal Government, as in the construction of public roads, to fix the standards and to maintain the work done with State funds as well as with its own at high efficiency. The money asked for will be spent in the 25 States which have previously qualified for Federal cooperation and in as many of the 14 additional States having important forest areas as meet Federal qualifications. In no case will Federal expenditures exceed those of the State itself, and in no case will Federal money be spent in a State unless the Forest Service is satisfied that the State laws and administrative system are adequate to get good results in the protection of forest areas through the investment of Federal funds.

This appropriation does not mean that the Federal Government relieves the owner of valuable timber from protecting his property. In the allotments to the States the chief emphasis is placed upon using the Federal funds so as to extend the protection organization of the State to culled, logged-off, and other denuded areas which contain little or no timber of present commercial value and whose owners have the least incentive to incur the cost of protection. These are the very areas whose protection is of the utmost importance in the general public interest, because upon them must we depend for our supply of timber after the present virgin forests are exhausted.

Mr. President, we have used up three-fourths of our original forests, and the supply of timber remaining is becoming less and less adequate for the requirements of the country, both in quantity and in location. Sixty-one per cent of what is left lies west of the Great Plains, whereas the bulk of lumber and paper consumption is east of the Great Plains. I might state here that over 50 per cent of the standing timber to-day is found in the three Pacific Coast States and 61 per cent is found in that great western country lying west of the Mississippi River. Our eastern forested States one after another have been cut out, and ceased to be important producers of timber because their virgin forests have been but very partially and inadequately replaced by second growth after logging. With the exhaustion of these old sources of lumber, paper, and other forest products and with the increasing distance which lumber must be hauled from the sawmill to the consumer, much of it now across the width of the continent, there is a growing scarcity of forest products, which in no great length of time will become critical. Markets may fluctuate one way or another owing to financial and other temporary conditions, but behind it lies a steady decrease in the supply of timber, which has a very vital bearing upon our national housing situation, our national paper situation, and many industries which use lumber in manufactures; and I might say, Mr. President, that the statistics show that one in every twenty persons in this country finds his livelihood in occupations directly connected with lumbering or in industries that are associated therewith.

The greatest cause of this situation is forest fires. We have enough land unfit for agriculture to grow all the timber which this country requires; but a large part of it has been made idle through destructive methods of logging and particularly through repeated forest fires. There are 81,000,000 acres of such land to-day that are unproductive, as far as timber crops of economic value are concerned; and forest fires are largely responsible for their condition. We still have upward of 200,000,000 acres of forest land which has been cut over, but

contains cull or second-growth timber or is partially stocked with young trees. The small timber and young growth on this enormous area is a forest asset of the utmost value. A considerable part of this area lies in thickly populated States within a stone's throw of large centers of timber consumption. And yet enormous acreages of such young forest are being destroyed by fire every year.

The private owner can be relied upon, by and large, to protect timber areas which have present commercial value; but these enormous stretches of young forest growth which will not mature without protection and of devastated land which can not be restored to forests without keeping fires out can be protected only by aggressive public action. The protection of these 315,000,000 acres adequately represents the greatest single forestry problem in the country, and of itself will go a long way toward assuring a future supply of timber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert in the Record a list of States showing cooperative expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 from Federal appropriations and appropriations by the States for protecting forested watersheds of navigable streams from fire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Cooperative expenditures, fiscal year 1920, from Federal appropriations and by the States for protecting forested watersheds of navigable streams from fire.

State.	Federal.	State.	Total.
Maine.....	\$10,432.25	\$116,844.11	\$127,276.33
New Hampshire.....	6,073.02	24,739.15	30,812.17
Vermont.....	1,978.00	5,879.46	7,857.46
Massachusetts.....	3,840.75	39,333.60	43,174.35
Rhode Island.....	294.00	1,762.45	2,056.45
Connecticut.....	932.25	4,839.27	5,771.52
New York.....	5,150.37	132,528.56	137,678.93
New Jersey.....	2,120.41	21,703.83	23,824.24
Pennsylvania.....	4,024.24	56,768.61	60,792.85
Maryland.....	1,790.55	4,585.84	6,376.39
Virginia.....	4,650.00	6,886.23	11,536.23
West Virginia.....	5,085.00	10,654.01	15,739.01
North Carolina.....	1,851.04	3,011.13	4,862.17
Kentucky.....	1,739.59	1,705.00	3,444.59
Louisiana.....	1,365.50	2,821.35	4,186.85
Texas.....	2,361.31	4,350.27	6,711.58
Michigan.....	2,110.00	60,586.46	62,696.46
Wisconsin.....	3,518.57	21,942.28	25,460.85
Minnesota.....	6,067.34	104,095.03	110,162.37
South Dakota.....	94.00	3,501.00	3,595.00
Montana.....	254.50	51,549.50	51,804.00
Idaho.....	5,415.50	92,524.37	97,939.87
Washington.....	5,206.00	48,951.34	54,157.34
Oregon.....	6,306.23	28,787.86	35,094.09
California.....	1,995.96	10,196.53	12,192.49
Administration and inspection.....	8,181.57		8,181.57
Total.....	92,837.86	860,548.24	953,386.10
Unexpended balance.....	7,162.14		
Appropriation.....	100,000.00		

Mr. McNARY. I also ask permission to insert in the Record as a part of my remarks a statement of additional States which should undertake forest-fire protection with Federal cooperation, but which to-day are not cooperating with the Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

Additional States which should undertake forest-fire prevention with Federal cooperation:

South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as a final word, much could be said upon the newsprint paper shortage, which is a serious problem to-day, and a committee of which I was a member undertook last year to study and prescribe a remedy; and much could be said about the threat of a great timber shortage in this country. I am not going to speak upon that general subject, but have limited my remarks to that phase which concerns cooperation of the States in the prevention of fires.

It may be said that this increase from \$125,000 to \$625,000 is a very large increase. In comparison with the expenditures of the States doing the same kind of work it is indeed a very modest increase, and is only one-half the sum asked by the department. Further, Mr. President, this is not a direct tax upon the Treasury of the country. None of this money, in fact, is directly appropriated for the splendid purpose for which it is intended, for the reason that the work of the Forest Service shows a very large profit each year, and this sum of money simply comes out of that fund.

To-day I was supplied by the Bureau of Forestry with a statement showing that the income derived from the forests in

the last year—that is, the Government forests—was \$4,793,482, whereas the total expense of protecting this great valuable natural resource was \$1,773,409, leaving a profit of \$3,000,000 to the Government. I sincerely hope, Mr. President, on behalf of the people who are interested in the protection of forests, that the Senate will agree with the action of the Senate committee.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McNARY. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the splendid speech of the junior Senator from Oregon, and I am thoroughly convinced as to the merits of the proposition which he presents. I want to ask the Senator if this amount is as much as the department estimated would be necessary to do this work?

Mr. McNARY. The department estimated, I am pleased to tell the Senator from Alabama, \$1,000,000. The House allowed \$125,000. I asked the Senate committee to add a half million, so that the total amount is \$625,000 against an estimate of a million dollars made by the department.

Mr. HEFLIN. It strikes me that if the Government derives more than \$3,000,000 profit from its national forests, the Government ought to expend whatever amount of money is necessary to protect these forests from destruction by fire. I feel like voting not only for the proposition carried in the bill but, if the other amount is really needed, I think that it ought to be granted. We ought to provide whatever is necessary to protect our national forests from destruction by fire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 17, to insert:

Field station, Woodward, Okla.: For the establishment in connection with the Woodward, Okla., field station of a live-stock department, through which experiments and demonstrations in live-stock breeding, growing, and feeding, including both beef and dairy animals, may be made, \$10,000.

Mr. GORE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted at the conclusion of the words just read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the words "ten thousand dollars" insert a comma and the words "of which said sum the Secretary is hereby authorized to use not exceeding \$3,000 for the purpose of building additional sheds, stalls, and pens for the protection and care of said animals."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, has any estimate been made for that appropriation?

Mr. GORE. The amendment I offered, I will say to the Senator, does not increase the amount reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I am asking in regard to the committee amendment.

Mr. GORE. This appropriation was made last year; but no provision was made for the construction of sheds, and so forth, and this is simply to continue it. It was not deemed advisable, as I am informed, to embark on the plan without the necessary sheds for the protection of the animals. There is a dry-farming station there, and this is supplemental to that.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that quite answers the question. The question is whether an estimate has been made for the appropriation carried by this amendment.

Mr. GORE. I could not answer that question. The chairman of the committee probably can.

Mr. THOMAS. I was asking the chairman.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not remember whether there was anything said about the buildings. The amount carried in the bill was estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 23, after the name "Alabama," to insert "and other States," so as to read:

Control and prevention of spread of the Mexican bean beetle: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the recent introduction and rapid multiplication of the Mexican bean beetle in the State of Alabama, and other States, and to provide means for the study, experimentation in eradication, and for the control and prevention of the spread of this insect in that State and to other States, in cooperation with the State of Alabama and other States concerned and with individuals affected, including the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$100,000, of which sum \$25,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, after line 14, to insert:

Purchase of farm loan bonds: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized from time to time during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1921 and 1922, respectively, to purchase at par and accrued interest, with any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, from any Federal land bank, farm loan bonds issued by such bank.

Such purchases shall not exceed the sum of \$100,000,000 in either of such fiscal years, shall be made only upon the recommendation in writing of the Federal Farm Loan Board, and the bonds so purchased shall bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

Any Federal land bank may at any time purchase, at par and accrued interest, for the purpose of redemption or resale, any bonds so purchased from it and held in the Treasury.

The bonds of any Federal land bank purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury and held in the Treasury under the provisions of this act, three years from the date of purchase shall, upon 30 days' notice from the Secretary of the Treasury, be redeemed or repurchased by such bank at par and accrued interest.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course that language, in the same amount, is carried in another bill which has passed the Senate and which is now in conference. The conferees have met, and the conferees on the part of the House have stated they were unable to accept it without submitting it back to the House as legislation. It has gone back to the House, and it will come out within one or two days. I take it for granted that we do not expect to carry the same legislation in two bills, and in more than the amount here stated.

Mr. GRONNA. If the item is agreed to in the legislative bill, of course it will come out of this bill.

Mr. WARREN. Then I understand if the bill comes out of conference containing that provision, on notification of the conferees to the Senator from North Dakota, this item will be taken out?

Mr. GRONNA. It will be eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if this amendment is subject to a point of order I shall make one against it. I make it on the ground that no estimate has been made for the item; also, that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. SWANSON. Before the point of order is ruled on, I want to suggest that the rule says that where an item in an appropriation bill has been reported by a standing committee of the Senate it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. It is general legislation.

Mr. SWANSON. It simply carries out the present law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is entirely new matter, and the point of order is sustained.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 10, to insert:

Purchase of seed grain for drought-stricken areas: That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1921, to make advances or loans to farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the United States, where he shall find that special need for such assistance exists, for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes when necessary, to procure such seed and sell same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each farmer to use the seed thus obtained by him for the production of grain. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed the sum of \$300. All such advances or loans shall be made through such agencies as the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000,000 immediately available.

Sec. 2. That any person who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee having charge of the bill if this amendment is a duplication of the bill passed a few days ago?

Mr. GRONNA. It is exactly the same language that was in the bill that was passed last Monday.

Mr. THOMAS. If that bill is accepted by the House, this will go out?

Mr. GRONNA. This provision will go out if that passes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The total for the estimate is changed on lines 14 and 15. After the numerals insert the following words:

and an authorization for the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase farm loan bonds, \$100,000,000, during the fiscal year 1921, and \$100,000,000 during the fiscal year 1922.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the consideration of committee amendments, except those passed over. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over is on page 7, passed over at the instance of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]. In the changing of the totals on lines 20 and 21 the amendments were passed over relating to general expenses of the Weather Bureau.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I offer to be inserted at that point. The Senator from Utah has approved the amendment, and I know of no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, after line 3, insert the following paragraph:

For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees when necessary, \$11,450: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire how the printing has been done in the past.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe it has been done by the Weather Bureau. The Senator from Utah is quite familiar with this matter. I have the estimate here. It is rather lengthy, but I shall have it read. I think perhaps that will give the information desired. I will ask the Secretary to read what the department has to say with regard to it.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

This item was eliminated through a point of order when the bill was under consideration in the House. The point of order was raised by Mr. KRESS, as he regarded a change in the language of the item necessary to avoid conflict with the provisions of section 11 of the legislative, executive, and judicial act approved March 1, 1919.

The Weather Bureau plant is admitted to be indispensable to the work of the bureau, and it is essential that the appropriation carried by the item be restored. A slight change in the language of the proviso will meet the wishes of the Joint Committee on Printing and also make the proviso conform to that passed by the House as an amendment of Representative Barnhart, then chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, during a debate on the bill for 1915. The amendment was agreed to by the Senate with the words "in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture" added. It is this added language that is now suggested omitted. The proposed language of the proviso is as follows: "Provided, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau."

In view of the authority conferred upon the Joint Committee on Printing by the provisions of section 11, it is believed that the omission of the words mentioned will in no way restrict the Secretary of Agriculture or the Chief of the Weather Bureau in the supervision and administrative control of this plant, nor will it in fact increase the powers of the Joint Committee on Printing, which are now very specifically defined in section 11 and other laws.

From conferences with members of the Joint Committee on Printing, it is the understanding of the department that the modified provision is not objectionable to them. Therefore, the restoration of this item in the following language is recommended, to be inserted on page 7, between lines 3 and 4:

"For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, including the pay of additional employees, when necessary, \$14,450: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said bureau."

The amount submitted is the same as was included in the estimates, but \$3,000 in excess of the item as reported to the House. The increase of \$3,000 is needed for the purchase of supplies, equipment, and repairs, due to expanded costs. There has been no increase in this subappropriation for six years.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the amendment be read.

The Assistant Secretary again read the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The totals will be changed to correspond with the amendment just agreed to. The next committee amendment passed over will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 16, under the heading "Bureau of Plant Industry, salaries," the amount passed over was where the committee proposes to insert in line 7, after the numerals "\$3,000," the following:

One administrative assistant in seed and plant distribution, \$3,000.

The amount was reduced by the Senate from \$3,000 to \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the increased salary for Mr. Jones.

Mr. GRONNA. The present law allows a salary of \$2,500. This would provide an increase of \$500.

Mr. SMOOT. With a great deal less responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amount has already been reduced to \$2,500 by the action of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. So I understood.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the record will show that I asked, before the final vote was taken, that the matter be passed over, and I understood the chairman of the committee that it would be passed over and taken up later, before a final vote was had upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair was not here at the time. He knows only what the Record shows.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the Record will show that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that the Senator may have a chance to have a vote upon it, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the reduction was agreed to may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the vote rejecting the amendment of the committee inserting "\$3,000" at the end of the clause is reconsidered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think the action of the committee ought to be sustained, because the matter was gone into thoroughly. I have said all I care to say about the work of this officer. Evidence of the estimate which the committee places upon him is recorded in the action taken by the committee, and I sincerely hope that \$3,000 will be retained, as well as the official.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to add to what the Senator from South Carolina has said, that for a number of years the seed appropriation has gone out of the bill in the Senate almost every year. There has been only one exception that I remember for six or seven years. When the appropriation for the purchase of free seed went out, the appropriation for Mr. Jones went out with it. It was uniformly returned to the bill in conference.

Of course, the conferees were powerless to increase the salary of Mr. Jones. He is an old, faithful, efficient, and, I may add, a very obliging employee of the Government. I think many Senators will bear testimony to his character and reputation in that respect. It has been impossible to increase his pay under the parliamentary situation in which we have found ourselves year after year. It is possible that the seed appropriation may return in conference. I hope not. But we have arranged it so that Mr. Jones will remain in office in any event, charged with other duties of less responsibility. I hope the slight increase in his compensation will be made as a reward for his long and faithful service.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to say just one word more. I appreciate fully the contention made on the floor of the Senate about the great number of employees who may not be essential and the contention against the raising of salaries. There is little encouragement to an employee of the Government who is faithfully serving the Government, giving efficient service, using thrift and all the ability that he has to render that service, and who then receives no recognition at the hands of those who have charge of the affairs of the Government.

The Department of Agriculture complain that in their scientific work they can not keep the efficient scientific men who are rendering such splendid service, because the Government can not and will not meet the competition of private interests, whereas the interests of the Government are paramount to any private interests. Here is one man who has proven himself capable and efficient, tried for years and never found wanting, and we have the opportunity of giving him the pitiful sum of \$3,000 a year, and yet there is a question as to the wisdom of that proceeding. It is small encouragement for men to give efficient work when those who have met the requirements that have been placed upon them efficiently have this kind of treatment at our hands.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to add merely one word. I am not going to say anything about Mr. Jones. We have many hundreds and thousands of employees who are just as loyal as Mr. Jones. He has been drawing \$2,500 a year for years and years. Among the duties devolving upon him was the distribution of valuable seeds, millions of packages of seeds. I have no doubt that the seed provision is going to remain out of the bill if the bill becomes a law at this session of Congress.

Now, we are taking away from Mr. Jones at least three-fourths of the responsibility that was placed on him previously, and increasing his salary \$500—I should say increasing his salary \$260, because with the salary of \$2,500 he gets a \$240 bonus, making \$2,740. The increase of salary now is to \$3,000, which, of course, under the law, would carry no bonus, and therefore the increase is \$260 instead of \$500, as stated.

So we have been treating this employee like we have been treating everybody else in the Government service. I can not see any reason why, now that this immense amount of work has been taken away from him, three-quarters of all of the responsibilities that the man has had, his salary should be increased. It is for that reason that I hope that the \$3,000, as reported by the committee, will be reduced to \$2,500.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Utah will let this go to conference. If I am appointed a member of the conference committee, I will assure the Senator that if the congressional seeds provision does not go back into the bill, the salary of Mr. Jones will not be increased over \$2,500, but if

it does go back, which we hope it will not, then I hope we can have the \$3,000 provision remain in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. With that understanding, I shall not object.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that "\$3,000" be substituted for "\$2,500."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is to reduce the amount to \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. I withdraw that motion, with the understanding contained in the statement just made by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Then the question will be upon agreeing to the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the question now pending.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 47, at the foot of the page, the committee proposed to strike out "\$38,000" and insert "\$30,000," for enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act approved March 2, 1897, entitled "An act to prevent the importation of impure and unwholesome tea," and so forth.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected. We labored under a misapprehension. I have a letter from the department which I will ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection and the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY,
Washington, February 15, 1921.

For the fiscal year 1921 the Agricultural appropriation bill carried an item under appropriation for the Bureau of Chemistry of \$40,000 for the enforcement of the tea act of March 2, 1897, which was less than was asked for at the time of the transfer of the tea law to this department. However, by strict economy and reorganization of this work under the Bureau of Chemistry, and with excellent cooperation from the Customs Service of the Treasury Department, this work has been carried on satisfactorily and efficiently, so that in making up the estimates for the fiscal year 1922, notwithstanding the higher cost of everything connected with the service, we were able to place our estimates at the same figures, \$40,000, but recommended that the lump sum be reduced about \$3,500 by shifting one clerk at \$1,500 per annum, one at \$1,400 per annum, and a messenger at \$600 per annum to the statutory roll of the bureau, thus reducing the lump sum to \$36,500.

The Appropriations Committee of the House transferred one clerk at \$1,400 per annum and the messenger at \$600 per annum to the statutory roll of the bureau, but did not transfer the clerk at \$1,500 per annum, but recommended that the lump sum for the enforcement of the tea act be \$38,000, which would have taken care of the clerk at \$1,500 per annum. These items as reported from the committee passed the House, but the Senate Agricultural Committee reported the bill out with the item for the enforcement of the tea act reduced to \$30,000, exclusive of the two positions transferred to the statutory roll, or at a net decrease of \$8,000, or 24 per cent.

If this reduction prevails, it will be absolutely impossible to enforce this act as Congress intended it should be enforced at the time of its passage, and as it has been enforced up to the present time.

Without the full enforcement of this law, the consumer can not be protected from impure and unwholesome tea, as the act provides, and uniformity of inspection of all teas entering the United States can not be continued. This latter condition, if allowed to occur, would bring about unfair competition among importers of teas, because teas below the physical standards of "purity, quality, and fitness for consumption" as fixed by the law, would gain entrance and go into competition with teas equal to the fixed standards, which would work to the detriment of the honest importer who lived up to the standards.

A policing measure of this kind to give full protection to the consumer as well as to the tea merchant must be enforced in its entirety, and any lack of enforcement in any direction nullifies the purposes for which the act was drawn, namely, to protect the consumer from impure and unwholesome teas.

The amount of money absolutely necessary to pay the salaries of the tea-examining force, exclusive of the two men on the statutory roll, which force can not be reduced without destroying the proper functioning of the service, is \$28,950. The difference between this amount and the amount proposed by the Senate bill is \$1,050, which would not cover the cost of fixing the Government standards, much less take care of the seven tea-examining offices, the drawing of samples, which must be taken from every line and grade and every shipment of tea, and for the traveling expenses of the inspectors and the maintenance of the United States Board of Tea Appeals.

It can be readily seen from these estimates that the reduction proposed in the bill now before the Senate can not spell anything but ruin to a law that protects the consumer from a food product that is one of the easiest to sophisticate and which, before the law was passed, was the most sophisticated and adulterated of any food product entering the United States; in fact, the United States was known as the dumping ground for all trashy and spurious teas.

Respectfully,

GEO. F. MITCHELL,
Supervising Tea Examiner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to further amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As he will remember, I introduced an amendment to establish an

experimental forestry station at Asheville, N. C. I understand the committee rejected the amendment, so far as it concerned the establishment of such a station at one particular place, but that the committee increased the appropriation under the head of "Silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations" by a sufficient amount to enable the department, if it saw proper, to establish the station at such place as it should determine.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that that is my understanding of the matter.

Mr. HARRISON. When we had the matter under consideration we had the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina before the committee.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. We have not yet finished the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the committee amendments had been concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. On behalf of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 54, line 17, after the word "Agriculture," it is proposed to insert the following:

to develop the best methods and means of dealing with and spraying against the codling moth and.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 54, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

For investigations of insects affecting greenhouse florists' stock and other ornamental plants, \$20,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does that amendment increase the amount of the appropriation for the investigation of insects?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; that increases the amount by \$20,000. I have very voluminous estimates for it, which I shall not take the time of the Senate to read, but it is a very important proposition, I will say to the Senator from Utah. I am sure he will not object to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 70, between lines 17 and 18, it is proposed to insert:

For investigations of the chemical and physical character of road materials, for continuing laboratory and field experiments, and for studies and investigations in road design, independently or in cooperation with the State highway departments and other agencies, \$148,200, payable out of the administrative fund provided by the Federal aid road act of July 11, 1916, as amended.

Mr. SMOOT. Was that estimated for?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; and I will say for the information of the Senate that the member of the Appropriations Committee in the other House who had the bill in charge, Mr. SYDNEY ANDERSON, brought this amendment over to me and said that it should go into the bill. I think it went out on a point of order or in some such way in the other House. We are spending \$400,000,000 for the construction of roads, and it seems to me that we ought to allow a sufficient amount to the Bureau of Roads to enable them to ascertain what sort of material ought to be used in road construction. I think it is a very important amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Why can not a part of that large appropriation be used for the purpose?

Mr. GRONNA. This does not enlarge the appropriation, I will say to the Senator from Colorado. It only permits taking out of the appropriation this amount.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from North Dakota said that we had appropriated several hundred million dollars for the building of roads. My question was why a part of that appropriation could not be used, and legitimately used, for this identical purpose?

Mr. GRONNA. As I understand, it can not be taken from that particular fund.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, perhaps it would be interesting to the Senate to know that when the first appropriation was made for this purpose, a number of years ago, it was \$10,000. Senators who have gone out to Chevy Chase will remember that a little wooden house, a road experimental station, was constructed in that vicinity. A part of the first appropriation was

spent for the building of that box house. Each year since we have had an appropriation for the purpose, until it has now reached the aggregate of \$148,000. I do not know what work that would cover, but I remember that one of the Senators from Colorado—not the present senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], however—was very much interested in the subject. The appropriation to which I have referred was the beginning of the proposition, and, I repeat, the appropriation has now grown to \$148,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. It involves merely the correction of a word.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 90, line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "by" and insert the word "be."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. On behalf of the committee, I offer another amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 90, between lines 13 and 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the President be, and is hereby, authorized and requested to extend invitations to foreign Governments to be represented by delegates in a world's dairy congress to be held in the United States in 1922: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to create any pecuniary obligation on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say that this is a matter which was overlooked by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I can not object to the amendment, but it will be followed by an appropriation to entertain the delegates while here.

Mr. SMOOT. As has uniformly been the case in the past.

Mr. THOMAS. As always is the case. Such invitations are accompanied by an express announcement that they will not cost anything, and then we are accused of inhospitality if we do not make the cost as much as the entertainment requires.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to say to the Senator from Colorado that this amendment is asked for by the President of the United States in a message which is contained in Document No. 347, of which I have a copy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if we are through with the committee amendments—

Mr. GRONNA. There is one more committee amendment to be offered.

Mr. NEW. Then, I shall withhold my amendment until the committee amendments shall have been concluded.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am requested by the chairman of the committee to present the amendment which I send to the desk to be inserted as a new section of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

To enable the joint committee of the two Houses on short-time rural credits, constituted and appointed in pursuance of Public No. 234, Sixty-sixth Congress, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, to continue and complete its labors and report, \$5,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee while I suggest an amendment. On page 7, in line 19, I move that the figures "\$81,020" be amended to read "\$181,020."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$81,020," and insert "\$181,020," so as to read:

For the maintenance of stations, for observing, measuring, and investigating atmospheric phenomena, including salaries, travel, and other expenses in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$181,020.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to enable the Weather Bureau to perform a necessary function for the aeronautical service, both in relation to the Army and to the Post Office Department. It is necessary for that service to be supplied with accurate reports of weather conditions, and the Weather Bureau naturally can supply them better and more cheaply than can any other agency. While the amendment apparently involves an increase of \$100,000 in the expense of conducting this service, as a matter of fact it involves no in-

crease at all, for if the work is not performed by the Weather Bureau it will have to be performed by the Army and by the Post Office Department; so that the money will be expended whether by one agency or the other. It is merely a question of whether it shall be spent by two services, the Army and the Post Office Department, or whether it shall be spent and the service performed by the Weather Bureau, which can carry on the work to much better effect and advantage than can the other services.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, why will not the three services do the same work and follow out the duplications which are apparent in so many other branches of the Government service? Does not the Senator think that the Army and the Post Office Department will do the same work, no matter whether we give this appropriation or not?

Mr. NEW. No; not if the work is done by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. I will watch the result with a great deal of apprehension. If the Post Office Department has the money for the work and the Army has the money for it, they are going to do the work, no matter whether the Weather Bureau does it or not.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator's amendment shall be adopted, then will the work be done by one agency and be paid for only once by that one?

Mr. NEW. I think so; that is, at least, the purpose of the amendment and of the paragraph in the bill which covers the matter.

Mr. HEFLIN. The work will be done by one department, and paid for by one department, where it is now being paid for and being performed by two?

Mr. NEW. The work that will be done by the Weather Bureau under my amendment will be done by the Army and by the Post Office Department in case the amendment is not adopted. It can be done better by the Weather Bureau, and much more satisfactorily and accurately than if done by the other two services.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Indiana that the Department of Agriculture sent in an estimate for \$281,000. The present law carries \$81,000 for this purpose, the same as the amount in the pending bill. As one of the members of the committee, I should have no objection to allowing the amendment to go to conference, increasing the amount as reported by \$100,000. I can not see that it will be an increase in appropriations if the work is not to be done by any other department, and as the Senator has assured that it will not be so done, I should be very glad to let the amendment go to conference, and we shall do the best we can to retain it.

Mr. NEW. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 53, and invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to the proposed amendment.

On page 53, line 22, I move to strike out "\$110,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$180,000."

The reason for that is that unless the appropriation carried in the bill is increased to that extent an important portion of the work intended to be accomplished by that provision in the bill will not be done. I have here a letter on the subject from Dr. Howard, the chief of the bureau, in which he says:

I thought that possibly you might desire to know that a mistake has evidently been made. The failure of the Senate committee to include in its report this increase as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture might be due to the fact that the increase of \$10,000 was asked to the stored-products item of the bill for truck-crop and stored-product insect investigations, making a total of \$40,000 for this subappropriation, which is identical in amount with the increase requested for the sweet-potato weevil work. Furthermore, the House committee might be under the impression that, inasmuch as it has recommended that \$15,000 be immediately available, this covers the amount desired. Without this amount of \$40,000 additional for sweet-potato weevil work, we will be in a very bad way for next year, as the \$15,000 to be made immediately available would scarcely more than cover our operations for the present fiscal year in eradicating this pest from northern Florida and that small portion of Georgia where it is now practically under control, owing to our efforts.

They have practically controlled the trouble in Georgia, but they have not reached it in Florida. It was through the efforts of the department in connection with this insect which destroys the sweet potato that it was eradicated in Georgia. Now they want to carry on the work in Florida, and they can not do it unless this appropriation is increased.

It is therefore suggested that in the act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, page 53, line 22, \$110,000 be struck out and \$180,000 be substituted.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that I am in thorough sympathy with the Senator in

getting liberal appropriations to eradicate these insects; but the estimate is only \$120,000, and we could not go above the estimate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think, perhaps, just as Dr. Howard says, the Senator confuses this estimate with some others. For instance, under two other subappropriation heads the amount estimated for was some \$50,000, and it was, perhaps, supposed that that was intended to cover this section, but it does not cover it. My impression is that the estimate for this item is \$160,000 or \$150,000. The committee took care of the other subappropriation items but they did not take care of this provision. They might have thought that the \$15,000 being immediately available would be sufficient, but that will be expended before this year is out.

Mr. GRONNA. The Book of Estimates shows an estimate of only \$120,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does not the \$120,000 apply to the one item of sweet-potato insects?

Mr. GRONNA. It applies to the paragraph on page 53, beginning with line 19, which reads as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting truck crops, including insects affecting the potato, sugar beet, cabbage, onion, tomato, beans, peas, etc., and insects affecting stored products.

The House allowed \$110,000, and then the item reads:

Of which sum \$15,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then the estimate is for \$120,000?

Mr. GRONNA. One hundred and twenty thousand dollars. I have no objection to increasing that to \$120,000 and letting it go to conference.

Mr. FLETCHER. Then I can not ask to go beyond the estimate. I will ask that the amendment be changed from \$110,000 to \$120,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment as modified.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 53, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$110,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$120,000."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I only want to say that my information is that the department has done very valuable work in my own State toward eradicating this trouble, and this is clearly one of the cases in which the appropriation made a year ago has brought valuable results.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I do so at the suggestion of the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who is absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 42, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

For the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in cooperation with the University of California, \$25,000.

Mr. McNARY. The reason for supporting this amendment is set forth very strongly by the chief forester, and I ask permission that his statement may be read, unless the chairman desires to dispose of the amendment otherwise.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this was not estimated for. I have no objection to having the statement of the chief forester read, but I regret to say that I can not approve it, as one member of the committee, and I hope it will not be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator make the point of order?

Mr. GRONNA. I should be very glad to submit it to a vote.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I should like to say a word on this subject.

Mr. THOMAS. I will make the point of order against the amendment, if it is not estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado make the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. If it is not estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I move to strike out lines 12, 13, 14, and 15, on page 50, which is the item that was the subject of some discussion this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 50, it is proposed to strike out lines 12 to 15, both inclusive, which read as follows:

For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply and methods of obtaining potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, \$86,840.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I have letters from the Director of the Geological Survey and the Director of the Bureau of Mines, both of whom concur in the views expressed

here this morning to the effect that this is a mere duplication of the work of those two branches of the Government.

Mr. Smith's letter is as follows:

I regard the work of the Bureau of Soils under the item "For exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply of potash, nitrates, and other fertilizers" as duplicating work being done by the United States Geological Survey under current law. Since 1912 appropriations made for the Geological Survey have provided for "researches with a view of determining geological conditions favorable to the presence of deposits of potash salts," and the search has been made in the deserts of the West for potash minerals, including potash nitrate. Such exploration for supplies of mineral raw materials is essentially geologic and the recognized province of the Geological Survey, irrespective of what use is made of the raw materials. For 10 years this is the position I have held in every conference with representatives of the Bureau of Soils, and, while cooperating with them, I have regretted this duplication of effort.

The investigation of methods of mining potash minerals, their manufacture, and especially the recovery of potash as by-products in metallurgical processes, is a subject outside the work of the Geological Survey, except the annual collection of the statistics of production. Since 1910 the technological investigations of mineral products have come under the Bureau of Mines, and with the technologic work of that bureau on potash the survey's geologic work on the same subject has been coordinated without duplication.

Yours, very cordially,

GEO. OTIS SMITH, Director.

So, Mr. President, the first part—that is, the part in the bill as it came from the House—is a straight duplication of the work of the Geological Survey. The part which originated with the Senate committee—the methods of obtaining the potash from the minerals in connection with which it is found—is a part of the work of the Bureau of Mines, as disclosed by the following letter from the Director of the Bureau of Mines:

In answer to your telephone call, in which you state that the Agricultural appropriation bill carried a clause "for exploration and investigation within the United States to determine possible sources of supply and method for obtaining potash, nitrates, and other natural fertilizers, \$86,840," and inquiring if this came within the work of the Bureau of Mines:

The organic act of the Bureau of Mines charges it "with the province and duty to conduct inquiries and scientific and technologic investigations concerning mining and the preparation, treatment, and utilization of mineral substances."

Further, in the act providing for the establishing and maintenance of mining experiment stations, it was stated that they were "for the purposes of making investigations and disseminating information * * * in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries * * * preventing unnecessary waste of resources, and otherwise contributing to the advancement of these industries." Accordingly, the Bureau of Mines has carried out considerable work in the mining, treatment, and utilization of the so-called nonmetallic minerals, which include potash, nitrates, phosphates, and other natural fertilizers. In addition, the bureau is planning to enlarge this work, having already placed in the hands of the mining committee of Congress for their consideration a bill to increase the appropriation to the Bureau of Mines for this very purpose, and such bill is now being considered by the Mines and Mining Committee of the House.

The bureau has been working on the recovery of potash and alumina from low-grade alunite at its Salt Lake station, and at the present time a branch of the nonmetallic work which has just been established at Tuscaloosa, Ala., will carry on investigations in connection with raw materials, both as regard potash and phosphate rock. In addition, during the war the Bureau of Mines was actively engaged in the metallurgical end of the manufacture of nitrates, this work being under Dr. C. L. Parson, then chief chemist of the bureau. Also, the Bureau of Mines, through its connection with the Anaconda Commission, detailed an engineer to study and report on the manufacture of phosphates and sulphuric acid, and this work has been partially published in a bureau bulletin.

Finally, the work of inspection and conservation of the mining operations on Government land, including phosphates and sodium minerals, under act of February 25, 1920, has been placed in the Bureau of Mines for administration.

The Geological Survey has carried out a great deal of work in connection with the geology, occurrence, and resources of these nonmetallic minerals, and functions closely with the Bureau of Mines without duplication.

Accordingly, it is my belief that the clause which provides for carrying on this work by the Agricultural Department does duplicate and overlap the work delegated to and now being carried out, so far as funds permit, by the Bureau of Mines.

Cordially, yours,

E. A. HOLBROOK,
Acting Director.

Accordingly it does not seem to me that there is any justification whatever for this item.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I can understand clearly how the two departments to which the Senator refers do the work to which he has called attention, but that is incidental to their work. It is almost like the coking of coal. Incidental to that there are certain by-products, but the Agricultural Department is charged with the specific duty of promoting agriculture, and I submit that one of the most important functions that it can discharge is to locate all possible sources of fertilizers and to give to the agricultural interests of this country that information. My interpretation of this clause would be that they are not restricted to the mineral sources alone but that they may go to any and every source that would tend to increase the supply of these necessary ingredients and inform the agricultural public of that fact.

It may be possible that in some respects the work of the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines may be in extension

of or may be helpful to the work of the Agricultural Department. But they are hunting minerals, and they are hunting them for general purposes, and for all purposes for which potash may be used, for which phosphorus may be used, or for which nitrates may be used. But the specific and definite purpose with which this department is charged is to find the sources of supply for agriculture, and if these departments can aid them in this work, well and good; but we should not strike from an Agricultural appropriation bill an appropriation which gives to the Department of Agriculture the duty and power to investigate and find the sources of a thing upon which agriculture depends.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if there is to be an appropriation made, if we will not allow even incidental and unavoidable duplication, that the appropriation should be taken from these two departments and that work left with the Agricultural Department. But that can not be done, because the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Soils are charged with hunting out the minerals and the soil, perhaps, of this country for the benefit of the general public. Incidentally, they find potash, and that is for the use of the general public. They find nitrates, and that is for the use of the general public. But this department is charged with searching for these minerals and other organic and inorganic substances for the purpose of making fertilizer, and the two are in distinct fields, only where one incidentally laps unavoidably the other. The purpose of that department is not to hunt fertilizer. That is only incidental.

The purpose of this is to search for the source, not only in the mineral field, in the inorganic field, but in the organic field, and I submit that we should not abate this appropriation, when we charge them with one of the prime elements upon which agriculture rests. I concede that there might be an incidental overlapping. I suppose that would occur in any department charged with a general duty and another with a specific or definite duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator is quite willing to amend it so as to exclude mineral sources, I shall not have the slightest objection to it. If he will make it "sources of natural fertilizer other than mineral," then he would have the situation just as he wants it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Perhaps the Senator would be more willing to agree with my standpoint if he would take into cognizance the fact that two years ago there was discovered a sort of potash in this country. I do not know just which one of the several departments promulgated that fact. The potash was bought by farmers all through the country and applied to the crops with disastrous results, so much so that some crops were a total loss. Upon investigation it was found that it was rich in potash content, but also had a percentage of borax, which, when applied to the soil, absolutely killed the plants.

The Bureau of Mines were hunting potash. They had found potash. The Bureau of the Agricultural Department wanted a potash suited for agriculture. In some of the industries throughout the country that potash might have been all-sufficient; the borax might not have been deleterious. But when we bought the potash in good faith, tobacco, corn, and cotton were starved.

Have you charged in your law that when they develop and find this potash, and publish abroad that they have a rich potash content available for the farm, they are to go into it and prepare it as a fertilizer? It is quite a different proposition. When the Bureau of Mines discovers a source of potash, under this the Department of Agriculture can go and test to find whether it is a sulphate or a muriate, or whether it contains deleterious chemicals which make it unfit for fertilizer.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from South Carolina is not unacquainted with the geological conditions under which these deposits are found. These nonmetallic substances are always found associated, and they are made useful for commercial purposes by a process of refining. That is the case with phosphates, that is the case with potash, that is the case with nitrates. That is a different thing altogether from discovering the source. To make these sources available by manufacture for the purpose desired is quite a different thing, not covered by this item of the appropriation bill at all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But the Senator will notice that the language says for exploration and investigation of the sources of and supply of fertilizer, not of chemicals, not of minerals, which in themselves may be ultimately reduced and adapted for fertilizer purposes, but they are charged with the specific duty of finding amongst the chemicals that the Bureau of Soils and the Bureau of Mines finds, which ones are adapted to fertilizer purposes. Therefore it is a distinct field in which this department is called upon to work, and I think it would be a disaster for us to strike from the bill this provision, which

guards and guarantees, through investigation, the people who must depend upon commercial fertilizers for the production of crops.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire to add just one word. It is true that the explorations made by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey for the purpose of discovering these minerals are to discover them for any use to which they may be put, not especially for the use in fertilizer. But if the argument of the Senator from South Carolina is correct, we ought to put a provision in the Army bill authorizing the Army to make explorations with a view to finding nitrates and potash for use in the manufacture of powder and other explosives.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think we do that identical thing, and that is part of the Army process. It is part of the building up of the Army.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Up to the present time the Army has not conducted any explorations for the purpose of finding sources of supply.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It had the chemists, who were all ready to take the sources and do what we propose these people shall do, find out what of the chemicals discovered are fit for explosives, and that is what we are doing, providing that they shall explore and find out, through investigation, what is fit for agriculture. I do not know what other language you could use which would protect the people of this country in the use of artificial fertilizers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 75, line 2, strike out "\$390,160" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000," so that it will read:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of live stock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$750,000.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I offer this amendment in an effort to try to make the appropriation in accordance with the recommendation of the department. I know of no more important undertaking of the Department of Agriculture, or one that is fraught with greater possibilities for benefit, than that covered by this particular paragraph, which provides for information to be furnished to the agricultural interests of the country upon market conditions.

The most serious problem of our producers of fruits and of vegetables is the one of markets. Many of the States, even, have established marketing bureaus, because it has been realized that there was such great necessity along this line. Under the policy which has already been inaugurated by the Federal Government, a great deal of good has been accomplished, and at this particular time to curtail the appropriation would very much hamper the department in furnishing information to the agricultural interests of the country regarding marketing conditions. The department estimated that \$750,000 would be necessary to carry on this important work, but for some reason the House thought proper to cut it down to \$390,000, and now the Senate committee recommends only that amount.

I know it is getting late in the day, Mr. President, and I shall not attempt to discuss the question at length, but I am fully convinced that there is great merit in the recommendation of the department that the appropriation should be \$750,000, and I have therefore moved that it be amended so as to grant the amount requested by the department.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a new section to be added at the end of the bill. I think the chairman of the committee will be willing to accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Add a new section at the end of the bill, as follows:

SEC. —. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed hereafter to submit to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report showing what investigations devolved upon the Department of Agriculture have been completed during the preceding fiscal year, and also showing what

services, if any, devolved upon the department are being performed or duplicated, in whole or in part, by any other department, bureau, or agency of the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on page 41, line 18, I move to strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 41, line 18, strike out "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000," in the item "for the investigation of methods for wood distillation and for the preservative treatment of timber," and so forth.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this is an increase of \$150,000 for the forest-products laboratory. Besides the forest-products laboratory which is located at Madison, Wis., there are four offices maintained in lumber-producing States, and there is also a small testing laboratory at Seattle, in Washington.

There is not a State in the Union where lumber is produced that has not as deep an interest in the maintenance at its fullest capacity for experimentation of the laboratory located at Madison, Wis., as have the people of Wisconsin and their Representatives. I have received many letters from lumbermen, not only in the State of Wisconsin but over the country, asking that the appropriation might be brought to the amount of the estimate of the department.

The work that is being done there in the elimination of waste is a perfect marvel. I know it was a great surprise to me, and I doubt if many Senators upon the floor know, that 75 per cent of a tree is absolutely wasted before it is converted into wrought lumber and put in the yard. Only 25 per cent of it is saved. Between 40 and 60 per cent of the material that goes from the lumber yard to be manufactured into furniture is wasted and lost.

In the matter of handles for tools made from hickory, two tons of that wood—and it is rather a precious wood, being used up very rapidly—when made into the finished product result in only 400 pounds of finished material. It is unnecessary that this waste should go on. It is wrong that it should go on.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate. I believe the amendment will carry without any speech from me in support of it, but if Senators are interested I have many facts and arguments that I would be glad to submit in support of it. I am very anxious to see it added to the bill. I do not wish to see expenditures made from the Treasury at this time that can not be justified, but every dollar invested under the amendment which I have proposed will be paid back an hundredfold, a thousandfold, to the people of the country.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILLIS. I desire to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the matter to which he has referred is by no means of merely local interest. I have received a large number of letters from lumbermen in my State. Ohio is not a great lumbering State, but the lumbermen there are interested in this proposition. If the Senator will permit me, I will read what one of them said in a letter to me:

WINCHESTER LUMBER CO.,
Winchester, Ohio, February 21, 1921.

Hon. FRANK B. WILLIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is our belief, in common with the majority of the wood-using industries of the United States, that the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has been of great service to the wood-working industries, because it serves our need by promoting conservation of our basic raw material.

We note that Congress plans to dispose of the appropriation bills before March 4. We note also that the Secretary of Agriculture has decided to ask Congress for only \$400,000 for the laboratory for the coming year in place of the \$500,000 originally asked for by the Chief of the Forest Service. It is possible that this appropriation may again be cut in the House or the Senate unless its Members are made to appreciate the value and need of research in forest products, both from the standpoint of the industries themselves and general public welfare.

We believe that an appropriation of \$500,000 for the Forest Products Laboratory would be money well expended, and we are taking the liberty of calling this matter to your attention, with the thought that you will be glad to lend the appropriation bill your support and personal influence. We would appreciate your letting us know what action you may be able to take in this matter.

Yours, very truly,

WINCHESTER LUMBER CO.
H. H. MEDELIN.

Our people are in favor of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, and I hope that it will be agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to add to what the Senator from Ohio has said, that we have been profiting out in

the State of Montana by the operations of the experiment station at Madison, and the work in connection with it has been called to my attention.

Our mountains are covered with a dense growth of small pine, generally known as lodge-pole pine, which rarely attains a size greater than 12 or 18 inches in diameter, and is of practically no value for timber purposes. It was then thought that it ought to be made available in some form for wood pulp, but the abundance of pitch in the timber forbade its use for that purpose.

The station at Madison has been conducting extensive experiments for the purpose of devising some plan by which this vast amount of timber can be utilized for the production of wood pulp. They have made very excellent progress, and the experimentations promise the highest degree of success. It would be a boon to the country if the paper supply could be augmented by that great source, and it is not at all improbable that it will be made wholly so by the operations of this valuable plant of the Government at Madison.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to add just this word to what has been said. At Bogalusa, La., there is what Louisianians claim to be the largest sawmill on earth. The principal stock is held by some people in Buffalo, N. Y., known as the Bogalusa Lumber Co. It has been going forward very rapidly in the most progressive manner. The general manager is Mr. W. H. Sullivan. Recently they decided to add an \$8,000,000 addition to their pulp-manufacturing plant. Mr. Sullivan has several times called to my attention the invaluable service rendered to his enterprise and to the lumber industry in Louisiana by the laboratory at Madison, Wis. He has appealed to me to assist in securing an increased appropriation for this purpose.

I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Ohio, and the Senator from Montana, that it would be a most wise addition to the bill. In my own State we are denuding the forests of timber very rapidly. We are trying to grow new forests. I do not know that the amendment would apply particularly to the loblolly pine that we are growing in the new forests, but I believe it would, because that pine, which grows very rapidly, is used largely for pulp, and the Madison wood products laboratory is finding new uses of lumber for pulp.

It is also training the people of Louisiana how to convert into paper pulp all the limbs and the refuse material. They are pretty nearly as good about that down there as they are in Chicago, where it is said they lose nothing of the hog but the squeal. Down in my State, as the result of the work of the Wisconsin Products Laboratory, some of the mills are losing literally nothing but the bark. They are also exhibiting great results there from the investigation of the stumps. The stumps of the pine trees contain very valuable products in the way of pitch, tar, turpentine, and resin, and other things that are immensely valuable. It is a very difficult problem for us now to get enough out of the stumps to make it pay to take them from the soil. It costs from \$30 to \$40 an acre to get rid of the stumps, and the Wisconsin laboratory is rapidly showing us how to get rid of them with profit.

I do not believe we could do more wisely than to agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am not inclined to take further time of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 90, after line 8, insert: That the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the State agricultural colleges and experiment stations and the United States Council of the World's Poultry Congress and other organizations, be, and he hereby is, authorized on behalf of the United States to make suitable exhibits at the World's Poultry Congress of the International Association of Poultry Inspectors and Investigators to be held at The Hague, Holland, September 6 to 13, 1921, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, for the preparation, assembling, transportation, maintenance, and demonstration of the exhibits, which exhibits, upon their return to the United States, shall be the property of the United States and remain under the control of the Department of Agriculture. And the Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to select and, out of the appropriation authorized hereunder, defray the expenses of three delegates who are officials or employees of the Department of Agriculture to attend the said congress and of investigating and reporting in connection with said congress on poultry conditions and methods of poultry production and marketing.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the hour is getting late, and there is no objection to the amendment so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the chairman in charge of the bill whether any estimate was made for the appropriation?

Mr. GRONNA. I do not believe there was an estimate made for it, but I was about to say that so far as the committee is concerned we are willing to let it go to conference.

Mr. THOMAS. If no estimate has been made for it, I wish to submit a point of order against it.

Mr. CALDER. I will not press the amendment, as I believe no estimate has been made.

Mr. THOMAS. I make the point of order against it if there has been no estimate for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There having been no estimate, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I move to add at an appropriate place in the bill the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Insert in the proper place in the bill the following:

That the sum of \$30,000 is hereby appropriated, to be immediately available for expenditure and to continue available during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a forest experiment station at such place in the State of Arizona as he may select, for the purpose of conducting in Arizona and adjacent States silvicultural, dendrological, and other experiments and investigations, independently or in cooperation with other branches of the Federal Government, with State, county, and municipal agencies, educational institutions, business organizations, and individuals, in order to determine the best methods for the management of forest lands.

Mr. ASHURST. In support of the amendment I will state that I introduced it as a separate bill and sent a copy to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. GRONNA] who in turn transmitted my letter to the Secretary of Agriculture. I also sent a copy to the department and have received the following letter from the Secretary, which I will read. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 2, 1921.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ASHURST: I have your letter of January 29 inclosing a copy of the bill introduced by you for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in Arizona. A letter of the same date was also received from Senator GRONNA, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which your bill was referred, asking for a report from this department on it. I take pleasure in inclosing for your information a copy of my reply to Senator GRONNA, from which you will see that the department recognizes the urgent need for the establishment of such a station and recommends the passage of the bill which you have introduced.

May I also take advantage of this opportunity to express my appreciation of your interest in the matter and the hope that you will be successful in securing favorable action?

Very sincerely, yours,

E. T. MEREDITH, Secretary.

The Secretary transmitted a copy of his letter to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], pointing out at some length the advisability, indeed, the necessity, of establishing the experiment station. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall have to be consistent. I made a point of order against a similar amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] a few moments ago, and I shall have to make one against this if no estimate was made for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Was there an estimate?

Mr. ASHURST. I have read the letter from the Department of Agriculture, and being frank with the Senate I doubt if that is an estimate under the law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not an estimate. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall be very brief. I offer another amendment, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert at the proper place in the bill the following:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to reimburse landowners residing on Yuma project, Arizona-California, for all moneys they have heretofore paid into the United States Reclamation Service for the operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system of said project.

That there is also hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be placed to the credit of the United States Reclamation Service and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of paying the operation and maintenance costs of said Colorado River front work and levee system on said Yuma project, Arizona-California, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and an additional sum of \$100,000 per annum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the operation and

maintenance of said Colorado River front work and levee system, it being hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to assume the obligation of caring for said river front work and levee system on said Yuma project, Arizona-California, and not to have the same charged to said project as any part of constructing or maintaining the reclamation work of said Yuma project, Arizona-California.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, a word in explanation of the amendment. The Reclamation Service constructed in Arizona-California a reclamation project near Yuma. Some forty-five or fifty thousand acres of land are irrigated there under this reclamation project. The third largest river in the United States, the Colorado River, which drains about 245,000 square miles, debouches into the point where the irrigated farms are. The result is that the water users there for many years past have been charged the enormous expense incurred by the Reclamation Service in retreating the banks and controlling that river. I am sure that ultimately, if not at this time, the Congress will declare that the farmers there—few in number, comparatively—should not and ought to be required to pay the expense of holding within a fixed channel a river which is not only interstate but which is international in character, and is, as I have said, the third largest river in the United States.

It will shock the conscience of a humane man to say that a few farmers must hold within its channel at that point the third largest river of our country, one that in July rises and whose cutting edge destroys many farms. That is my reason for offering the amendment to this bill. I offer the amendment, and hope that no Senator will make a point of order against it, although I know it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator withhold his point of order until I put into the RECORD some figures?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. The water which comes down each year, the run-off which passes Yuma, where these farms are located, amounts to an average of 19,000,000 acre-feet; in other words, it is enough to cover 19,000,000 acres with water 1 foot deep.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the argument of the Senator from Arizona; I think that the Government of the United States has imposed upon it the duty of protecting that section of the country from river inundations; but I do not think this is the way to get at it, and particularly as there has been no estimate of the amounts of money expended or of the extent to which attempted reversion of the river by private enterprise has gone. I am therefore compelled to make the point of order against the amendment, there being no estimate for the expenditure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ASHURST. I shall thank the Chair and the Senate for indulging me long enough to offer another amendment. I ask the Secretary to recur to page 23, line 20, of the bill. Commencing with line 17, on that page, the language reads as follows:

For investigations in connection with western irrigation agriculture, the utilization of lands reclaimed under the reclamation act, and other areas in the arid and semiarid regions, \$70,000.

I propose an amendment to increase the numerals in line 20 from \$70,000 to \$94,420.

I was recently traveling through the West, not in my own State but in another State, and some of the citizens appealed to me to assist their Senators, if possible, in securing an investigation of a valley there the soil of which would be very fertile, and if water could be placed upon it would produce abundant crops. The citizens directed a letter to the Reclamation Service, but the reply was to the effect that the service did not have adequate funds with which to make an investigation as to the suitability or the feasibility of a reclamation project at that point. In Arizona I was recently appealed to by the citizens of the town of Winslow, which is on the Little Colorado River, with vast tracts of land adjacent, upon which practically no crops are grown, which is wholly a desert, and yet with the Little Colorado River running through it. So the Representative of Arizona in Congress, Mr. HAYDEN, telegraphed or wrote to the Chief of the Reclamation Service and simply asked him to send some person from the Reclamation Service to investigate the soil and water supply in order to ascertain the suitability or the feasibility of a project at that point. The Reclamation Office replied to Mr. HAYDEN to the effect that they had no funds with which they could make such an investigation.

The estimate of the department for this item is \$94,420. It will simply give the Reclamation Service an adequate fund with which that service may examine into the feasibility or the suitability of reclamation projects at a particular point. No more worthy appropriation could be made, as citizens of our country are entitled to have some governmental agency tell them offi-

cially from a scientific standpoint whether or not a project could successfully be established at a particular point.

When we speak of irrigation we must not forget that there are 18,000,000 acres in the United States now under irrigation, but only 2,000,000 acres are irrigated by the Government, whilst 16,000,000 acres are irrigated by private enterprise, and I can not at the moment conceive of an appropriation more worthy or more beneficial to the country than one that will provide adequate moneys to the department to enable it to ascertain whether or not the physical features here or there are such as to encourage farmers and home builders in indulging any further hope for a Government project.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRONNA. I merely wished to ask the Senator from Arizona a question.

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. This is a very meritorious amendment, undoubtedly, but the present law carries \$52,380, I believe. The House increased that amount and made it \$70,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; the House fixed the sum at \$70,000.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say that the committee did not go into this particular case in any minute detail, but I have no objection to letting the amendment go to conference, inasmuch as it proposes to appropriate the amount estimated for.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator. The amendment is not subject to a point of order, as it was estimated for by the department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this is the bill that provides for the construction of public roads, and it is very proper that the Bureau of Road Construction should be under the Agricultural Department, and that provisions respecting appropriations and policies in connection with road building should be incorporated in this bill. There is pending in the Senate a bill to which a majority of the Senate have already recorded themselves as favorable. I believe on the motion to suspend the rule to make in order as an amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill the road bill appropriating \$100,000,000 to carry on road construction in the United States the vote was 42 yeas to 33 nays, so that there was a majority of 9 in favor of that bill. The same bill has already passed the House by a vote of 230 to 30.

Of course, the Post Office appropriation bill was not as appropriate a measure to carry a piece of legislation such as the road bill which passed the House as is the Agricultural appropriation bill. It is undeniable, I imagine, at least it is not a controverted proposition, that the road bill as passed by the House should be considered at this time in connection with a general appropriation bill for agricultural and road-construction purposes. Since the Senate has already declared itself as favorable to the road bill, even under the peculiar circumstances of having to vote to suspend the rules to place it on an appropriation bill, certainly no Senator would object or would make a point of order, and thereby prevent the placing of this piece of legislation providing \$100,000,000 for road construction on a general appropriation bill for agricultural purposes.

So I am going to offer as an amendment to the pending bill, a bill which has already passed by such a tremendous vote the House of Representatives, which has already been sanctioned by a majority of 9 in the Senate, 42 Members of the Senate saying that even the rules of the Senate should be suspended in order that this proposed legislation might be passed. I sincerely hope that no point of order will be made against it, and that no objection will be made to it, because not only what I have narrated is true, but on the 4th of March this Congress will adjourn; there are many bills on the calendar; we are trying to expedite the passage of all the general supply bills, and practically no other legislation will come up from now until the 4th of March, there being only a very few working days remaining. So unless we incorporate in the pending appropriation bill the very important piece of legislation to which I have referred, appropriating \$100,000,000 to carry on this general road construction policy, the bill which was passed by the House will die on the 4th of March. I am sure the Senate does not desire that the measure shall die during this Congress which will necessitate our going to work at the next session and passing it through both House and Senate at that time. So I offer as an amendment to the pending appropriation bill, the road bill which has been championed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and which has already received the indorsement of the Senate by a majority of 9 votes.

The amendment proposed by Mr. HARRISON is, in line 18, page 72, to insert:

That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following additional sums:

The sum of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

The aforesaid additional sum shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That the aforesaid additional sum, together with any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto and not heretofore withdrawn from the principal fund, as provided by section 6 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1919, shall be available for expenditure in that State for the purpose set forth in such acts until two years after the close of the respective fiscal years for which any such sums become available, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of such acts shall be reapportioned in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916: *Provided further*, That in each State in which the percentage of total land area to which the title of the United States is unqualified or exempt by act of Congress from taxation in said State exceeds 10 per cent of the total area of all lands in the State the Secretary of Agriculture may reduce the ratio of cooperation required, but not to below one-half that which the total of the patented, tax exempt, and national forest land bears to the total area of all lands in the State.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for national forest roads and trails.

The said appropriations for national forest roads and trails to be available until expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads or trails within, partly within, or contiguous to the national forests when such roads or trails are necessary for the use and development of the resources of the national forests or desirable for their proper administration, protection, and improvement or for the extension of important main highways.

Sec. 3. That any person, firm, corporation, member of any highway commission, or employee thereof that makes any false statement or representation as to the character of material used or quality of work performed in the construction of any project approved by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of said act with the intent to defraud the United States shall upon conviction be imprisoned not to exceed five years or pay a fine not to exceed \$10,000, or be punished by both imprisonment and fine.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall have to disappoint my friend from Mississippi. It is true that there was a vote on the motion to suspend the rules so as to make in order the measure which the Senator from Mississippi now presents, and on that motion the bill commanded a majority, but not two-thirds. It is a disagreeable duty, of course, to perform when such a vast sum as \$100,000,000 is so near and with a point of order becomes so far. I think, however, that the country will get along and road building will continue under existing appropriations if this measure goes over until the next Congress, when a Republican Senate and a Republican House may pass it, and not only get all the prestige out of it, if there be any, but may also refer to the fact that it would have passed the Senate but for the objection of a Democrat. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 59, line 25, after the numerals "\$2,000," it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the line, and on page 60, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the numerals "\$1,800" where they first appear and to insert in lieu thereof, on page 59, line 23, after the numerals "\$3,000," the following:

One chief cinematographer, \$2,500.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this place was estimated for. The amendment provides a different title for the man who makes all the important moving pictures for the Department of Agriculture. At present he is paid under the title of "assistant in document section, \$1,800." This amendment provides that he shall get \$2,500.

I know of no better recommendation for this man than to read just a brief statement of the Chief of the Division of Publications when he appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture. He said:

As I have said, gentlemen, he is an excellent motion-picture photographer, and he is a man who could unquestionably demand a very much higher salary outside of the department. Incidentally, he was pretty severely injured last year in getting some pictures for the department and was laid up for a considerable length of time. I feel that it is particularly important that we pay this man more money

if we are going to retain his services. We can not hope to keep him for the money we now can pay him and we could not replace him for twice the salary he is now getting. I regard the promotion * * * for this man as * * * most important.

Mr. President, I know this man. I know that he has made several important inventions and given them to the Government, and I believe that the Government would do well to give him this increase of \$700 per annum. I am afraid that if we do not, outside moving-picture concerns will take him, and the Government will lose a good man and have difficulty in replacing him.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suppose the object of changing this man's title is to increase his salary. If we do this with one man, I think we will have to do it with all engaged in this business, and there are a great many of them in the Government service at the present time. I should think, for example, we would want to increase the salary of the photographer who takes pictures for the O'Connor Stock Co.

I noticed the other day in the paper an advertisement of the O'Connor Stock Co. I never had heard of that stock company before, and I read the advertisement down, and I found that the performance was to be held in the conference room of the Post Office Building. A couple of years ago I called attention to the fact that we had a theater down here, and that we ought to use the space for employees of the Government, but that that whole space was set aside for a theater in the Post Office Building down on Pennsylvania Avenue; and immediately after I called the attention of the Senate to it the name of the theater was changed to the "conference room." I see now that the O'Connor Stock Co. is to be playing at the conference room of the Post Office Building, Eleventh Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. It says what they are going to be interested in and what the play is to be.

I think the time has come when this ought to stop. I received, I think, three letters last week from employees of the Government complaining bitterly because they were called, after they had worked in some cases and in some cases during their work, to go and attend social functions in the departments. I do not know where we are drifting, and I want to know if this item was estimated for at \$2,500.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I will say to the Senator that it was estimated for at \$2,500.

Mr. SMOOT. This man is drawing \$1,800 now?

Mr. GRONNA. He is drawing \$1,800 now; yes. The committee did not see fit to approve the recommendation, and I hope it will not prevail.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, was there not an estimate for a general increase of salaries at this time?

Mr. GRONNA. There was an estimate for a general increase, but it was not allowed.

Mr. WARREN. It was estimated, however?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. They estimated for increases all the way through?

Mr. GRONNA. In a great many instances they did, I think.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this man has nothing whatever to do with the O'Connor Stock Co., to which the Senator from Utah has referred. I will say to the Senate that there is no more efficient man in the Government employ than this man. Last year he was borrowed by the Navy Department to take overhead pictures from aircraft of the fleet in the Chesapeake. The plane from which he was taking pictures fell, and he was nearly killed, and was laid up for three months in the hospital. Subsequently, when he recovered his health, he was sent to Minneapolis to take pictures in flour mills there for the Department of Agriculture. There, again, through an explosion, he was very nearly killed.

Mr. President, I repeat that there is no more efficient public servant than this man, and I say to the Senate that if they fail to increase his pay in all probability they will lose him, and then they will have an estimate next year for \$5,000 for a man to fill his place.

I hope the Senate will agree to my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 46 of the bill, to which I call the attention of the chairman of the committee. It is advocated by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Meredith. It is, on line 20, after the word "sirup," to add the words "and sugar," so that it will read:

For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and sugar and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups—

And so forth.

I do not wish to make any speech. I ask to have published as a part of my remarks the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture. It is addressed to Chairman GRONNA, on the 18th instant, and it says, in substance, that—

It is not the intention to divert to the study of sugar production any funds which are needed for the development and improvement of methods of producing table sirups. The amendment proposed will merely permit the Bureau of Chemistry to apply in the most effective manner the information and knowledge gained as a result of its investigation—

And so forth.

I will ask the chairman if he has investigated the matter?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, so far as I can, I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. RANSDELL. It does not add a cent of expense.

Mr. SMOOT. It will next year.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask to have the letter to which I refer published in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be done.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 18, 1921.

HON. ASLE J. GRONNA,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GRONNA: I desire to suggest, for your consideration, the insertion of the words "and sugar" in line 20, page 46, of the Agricultural appropriation bill as reported to the Senate, so that the provision (lines 19 and 20) will read:

"For the investigation and development of methods for the manufacture of table sirup and sugar and of methods for the manufacture of sweet sirups * * *"

The proposed change will greatly facilitate the work of the Bureau of Chemistry in applying to processes of sugar production the information gained in connection with the study of the production of table sirups, of which cane sirup has been the principal subject of investigation. The production of cane sirup and of cane sugar are very closely related, inasmuch as the clarification of the juice is the principal feature of both these processes, and the Bureau of Chemistry has found that much of the information acquired in connection with the production of cane sirup can be very readily applied with profit to the production of sugar. The insertion of the words "and sugar," as suggested, will give that bureau greater freedom in applying this knowledge, without interfering in any way with the work on cane sirup. It is not the intention to divert to the study of sugar production any funds which are needed for the development and improvement of methods of producing table sirups. The amendment proposed will merely permit the Bureau of Chemistry to apply, in the most effective manner, the information and knowledge gained as a result of its investigation. The application of this information to the production of sugar is, of course, merely incidental and subsidiary to the study of the production of cane sirup and table sirups in general.

Very truly, yours,

E. T. MEREDITH, Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, for the Senator from California [Mr. PHILAN], who is unavoidably absent, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase and acquire the lands occupied by the department's experiment vineyards near Fresno and Oakville, Calif., now maintained under contracts with the owners of said lands: *Provided*, That the land purchased for the Fresno vineyard shall not exceed 20 acres at a cost not to exceed \$12,000 and for the Oakville vineyard not to exceed 20 acres at a cost not to exceed \$15,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there has been no estimate for that appropriation, and I make the point of order against it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, the Senator will see that no appropriation is made.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; \$12,000 and \$15,000.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is simply an authorization to buy.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the same thing.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, no. There is no appropriation made, so that that point of order, I take it, would not lie.

Mr. SMOOT. Then it is general legislation on an appropriation bill, and not reported by a standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; it has been authorized to be reported by the Senate Agricultural Committee as a separate bill, though not as an amendment to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think a thing can be purchased without paying for it in some way. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on page 48, I move to strike out lines 1 to 7, as follows:

For investigating the grading, weighing, handling, transportation, and uses of naval stores, the preparation of definite type samples thereof, and for the demonstration of improved methods or processes of preparing naval stores, in cooperation with individuals and companies, including the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$10,000.

That item was put in the bill a number of years ago, for one year. It has been running now for several years, and I can not see that there is any use whatever in the appropriation. The last time when the question arose it was said: "Well, let it go in for one more year." It went in that year and I think it ought to go out now.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not think this has been a useless appropriation at all. I think the department has been doing very good work under it. They now have rosin, for instance, classified, and they have naval stores standardized in a way, and they are doing first-rate work under this appropriation. I think it is quite an important appropriation. The industry of naval stores, including rosin and turpentine, is a very considerable one. The appropriation is small, and I think it ought to be continued.

Mr. SMOOT. Three years ago, at the time the question came up, it was asked that it should go in for that year, and at that time the committee did not report it out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it was not limited to one year at that time. I presented the original provision.

Mr. SMOOT. It was limited because all the appropriations were limited for one year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But it was not limited according to the suggestion of the Senator. As he says, all appropriations are made for one year.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but on the floor of the Senate, when the question arose as to whether it should be put into the bill, they said: "Well, let it go in for one more year," and that was three years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That may be true, but it is an important appropriation. The industry is a very large one. The appropriation has been used to do excellent work; the men interested are very numerous; the amount of our exports of naval stores is very large; the standardization and the other work that is being done by the Department of Agriculture is helping our foreign commerce, and is of value to the producers.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I want to tell the Senator what this work is. I am afraid he does not know. They have recently discovered a new way of making rosin out of turpentine stumps, and the colors shift and change, and they tell the value of the rosin by the colors. They have people working on these standards of various colors. They have standardized it a good deal like they have cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. Just exactly.

Mr. HARRISON. The work has not been finished yet. It has been estimated for. I do not know when it will be finished, but it is rendering valuable service to a big industry in this country, and the appropriation should be made.

Mr. SMOOT. My information is that the work is completed, and that they have prepared these samples showing the colors. They are about 3 inches in circumference and show the colors of all the different grades.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the information of the Senator is inaccurate.

Mr. SMOOT. I think I got my information pretty straight.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I received mine directly from the head of the naval stores organization at Savannah, Ga., and I am assured by them that the work is still progressing and is still necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not only that, but the item covers the question of the use of naval stores. It can never be done in one year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments to be proposed? If not, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There was one amendment which the chairman of the committee said he would offer again.

Mr. GRONNA. That is true; but it was with reference to the preparing and packing of fish and sea food of all kinds. The Senator from Utah has some information showing that it is really a duplication, and I said to the Senator from Utah that I would not press the amendment. The Senator from Utah promised that he would have the information inserted in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. So that the record may be complete, I ask that a letter I received from the Secretary of Commerce, dated February 23, 1921, sent to me this morning, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 23, 1921.

Mr. DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the debate on the Agriculture appropriation bill, reported on pages 3616 to 3619 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 22. In order to clear some points which appear to have been in doubt I am inclosing herewith a copy of a letter recently sent to Mr. SYDNEY ANDERSON, of the House Committee on Appropriations, in response to an inquiry from him. This letter states briefly the character of the work which the Bureau of Fisheries has been conducting for a number of years in the preparation of fishery products for food.

I may state that in a conference held in my office on December 21, with the Secretary of Agriculture and several officials of his department, Dr. Alsborg stated that the work of the character described was properly the function of the Bureau of Fisheries, and that the Bureau of Chemistry was willing to withdraw from investigations of the character indicated. He volunteered to make a statement to that effect to the Appropriations Committee.

Very truly, yours,

J. W. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. REED SMOOT,
United States Senate.

FEBRUARY 18, 1921.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of February 14, you are informed that the problems of preservation and utilization of the products of the fisheries have been recognized as functions of the Bureau of Fisheries from its inception and have received attention dating back to its very early history when the demand and need for such work was not so fully appreciated as now. For example, in the report of the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries for 1882, pages 44 to 45, is to be found an outline or plan for investigation of the fisheries of the United States, then about to be undertaken, which included "VI. Preparation, care of, and manufacture of fishery products. Here were to be considered the methods and the various devices for utilizing fish after they are caught, with statistics of capital and men employed, etc.: (a) Preservation of live fish; (b) refrigeration; (c) sun drying; (d) smoke drying; (e) pickling; (f) hermetically canning; (g) fur dressing; (h) whalebone preparation; (i) isinglass manufacture; (k) ambergris manufacture; (l) fish-guano manufacture; (m) oil rendering, etc." Section 5, in three volumes, of the monumental work "Fisheries and Fishery Industries of the United States, 1884-1887," contains considerable descriptive matter and illustrations of the methods of preservation and utilization of fishery products.

An examination of the subject matter contained in the publications referred to in the inclosed memorandum will serve to illustrate some phases of the bureau's work in this field in past years.

In recent years there has been an increasing demand for research work in fisheries technology for effecting improvements in the methods of preservation, distribution, and utilization of fishery products, including by-products. The bureau has endeavored to meet this demand as fully as the limited appropriations would permit. It has in Washington a fishery-products laboratory, excellently equipped, for investigations in the preservation of fish by canning, freezing in air and in brine, smoking, and drying, a constant temperature room for testing the keeping qualities of preserved products, and a research laboratory for such necessary incidental physical and chemical tests as may be required. In southern California it has a temporary laboratory well equipped for the solution of the practical problems of the fisheries of that region, particularly those problems common to that region which can be more efficiently handled at the center of operations.

The bureau has recently completed an investigation on the preservation of fish by salting in which certain improvements in commercial practices have been made, particularly in the salting of fish at high temperatures and therefore in warm climates, and has had practical application made of the results. This work was done in part in Washington, D. C., and several States on the Atlantic seaboard, particularly Florida, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, and Massachusetts.

Its plant for freezing in brine was the first of its kind to be imported into this country and has been employed to demonstrate this method of brine freezing fish to the trade and trials given of freezing fruits and vegetables and meats, poultry, etc., for the benefit of investigators in the Bureaus of Plant and Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture. In fact, it is understood that one of these bureaus has since arranged to employ this method in its particular field of operation. The bureau's investigations in this field have been interfered with during the current fiscal year for lack of adequate funds and technologists. It now appears that this condition will be remedied with respect to the next fiscal year.

In southern California extended investigations have been made for the purpose of developing methods of canning fish for which satisfactory methods were lacking, in effecting improvements in common practice, and in solving the practical problems of the canners. Special attention has been devoted to the canning of mackerel, barracuda, bonito, pilchard, sea bass, smelt, tuna, and yellowtail, and to the recovery of fry-bath oil, means of avoiding objectionable flavor in bonito, and the like. This work has been centered chiefly at San Pedro.

The bureau's work in the utilization of the by-products of the fisheries has been particularly fortunate. It has been instrumental in greatly extending the production of fish meal for use as a stock feed within the last few years, in the establishment of fisheries for sharks and other unutilized aquatic animals, in the use of the hides for tanning into leather, the saving of dried fins for the oriental trade, in determining the special properties of particular fish oils, the more extended use of fish waste and waste fish, and the like. This work has been done in Washington and the field.

Among its other activities, mention may be made of its investigations as to the causes of reddening of salt fish, study of the causative organisms and possibilities of preventing the heavy losses resulting from this source of infection. This work has been done chiefly in New England. Mention may also be made of the investigations concerning the feasibility of deriving from marine algae a gelatin suitable for use in the preservation of fish, which was conducted in Massachusetts.

It is scarcely practicable to cover the bureau's work in this field within the scope of a letter, but there are being mailed to you a copy of Bureau of Fisheries Document 892, "Fishery Industries of the United States," a report summarizing on pages 9 to 17 some of the work done in the calendar year 1919; a copy of Document 896, "Prog-

ress in Biological Inquiries," on page 27 of which you will find additional information on the reddening of salt fish, and page 29 reference to the deriving of jelly from seaweeds.

As the particular phases of the work mentioned in your letter present only parts of its activities, it is difficult to furnish a statement for the specific items because of their interrelations and overlapping other activities. It is hoped the following statement will serve your purpose:

Items for fiscal year ended June 30, 1920.

Investigations of the fishery-products laboratory in Washington and necessary work in field connected therewith, including maintenance of laboratory.....	\$3,165.79
Practical application of methods evolved in salting of fish.....	326.04
Utilization of the waste products of the fisheries.....	1,130.07
Preservation of fishes and standardization of methods in southern California.....	3,389.37
Investigations in reddening of salt fish, dehydration of fish, and derivation of jelly from seaweeds (approximately)....	700.00

In closing I may state that the work of the Bureau of Fisheries for the fishing industry is comparable to the work of the agricultural bureaus mentioned in their respective fields, that it is working in close touch with them, cooperating where cooperation is for the best interests of the people whom they are intended to serve, and avoiding duplication of work.

Very truly, yours,

J. W. ALEXANDER,
Secretary.

Hon. SYDNEY ANDERSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment originally offered by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 46, after line 6, insert:

For investigating the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish, and for experimental shipments of these products, for the utilization of waste products, and the development of new sources of food, \$20,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it is probably a part of the function of the Bureau of Fisheries, under the Department of Commerce, to investigate the sources of fish-food supplies, new varieties of fish, and that sort of thing; but it is no part of the functions of that department to investigate the handling, grading, packing, canning, freezing, storing, and transportation of fish, shrimp, and oysters; and I think that ought to be done by the Department of Agriculture. Fish is an important food supply of the country. The Department of Commerce undertakes to investigate and ascertain the varieties of fish which may be used for food. A few years ago Secretary Redfield did discover that the tilefish had come back into the ocean, and he exploited that, and people began to use the tilefish a good deal, and I think changed the name of it so as to make it a little more palatable. At any rate, the work of the department had to do with discovering new edible fish; but it did not have to do with informing the people themselves, who catch the fish in the lakes and in the rivers and in the seas, and who get the oysters and shrimp, how to pack, how to preserve, and how to take care of those fish, and how to ship them. That is work for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I read the letter from the Secretary?

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator reads that, I understand he is going to oppose this item on the ground that the work is already being done?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator overlooks the real point and value of the item. It is to employ two men to do what one man can do.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think perhaps I can save the time required in reading the letter. I talked with Dr. Alsberg over the phone to-day, and he said this is very important work, but it can probably be transferred to the Bureau of Fisheries, and that he had no objection if that were done, if provision was made for its support in another bureau, and I understand from the Senator from Utah that it is taken care of in another appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have here the bulletins showing the work that has been done. I will not take the time to read the letter, but the Secretary says it is a duplication of work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. KENYON, Mr. McNARY, Mr. GORE, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina conferees on the part of the Senate.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 15935, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 15935) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF DAUPHINE STREET, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5030) authorizing the city of New Orleans, La., to extend Dauphine Street, in said city, across the United States military reservation known as the Jackson Barracks. This is a bill in which the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is interested and to which there is no opposition. I ask unanimous consent for its passage.

Mr. RANSDELL. It merely authorizes the extension of Dauphine Street, in New Orleans, through a military reservation in that city. The bill was drawn by the Secretary of War, recommended by him, and is now favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, be, and it hereby is, authorized to extend Dauphine Street, in said city, across and through the property of the United States known as the military reservation of Jackson Barracks, said extension to be of the same width and a continuation of the same lines as said street at its juncture with Dauphine Street upon the easterly side of said reservation, upon condition that said street shall be improved and maintained by said city of New Orleans as a public street and without cost to the United States; *Provided, however,* That there is hereby expressly reserved to the United States the right to construct and maintain over, under, and across that said street water, gas, and sewer mains, electric lights, and telephone wires and cables, and any other requisite utilities which the use of said military reservation may require.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, February 24, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 23, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for every new born day, for every new born soul, for every new born idea that brings us and the world in closer communion with Thee, that we may enter the kingdom of heaven and be indeed Thy children, led by Thy wisdom, by Thy power, and by Thy love into a larger, purer, nobler, and sweeter life; that we may be all for Thee, with Thy spirit our guide and Thy council our thought; that the world may be better that we have lived and wrought. Give us Thy best convictions that we may do ever well here and now and evermore. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REGULATING SHIPMENT OF COLD-STORAGE FOODS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 9521.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, pending the request I would like to make the point of order of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order of no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony
Bacharach
Baer
Britthead
Bell

Benson
Bland, Mo.
Boies
Britten
Brumbaugh

Burdick
Byrnes, S. C.
Byrnes, Tenn.
Caldwell
Candler

Casey
Clark, Fla.
Clark, Mo.
Classon
Coady